NOTICE:

THE CONCEPTUAL CONTENTS OF THIS
VOLUME ARE PRACTICALLY READY.

HOWEVER, AFTER INCORPORATING THE EXCELLENT
CORRECTIONS OF THE ENGLISH BY PROFESOR IAN WOODWORD
TO CHAPTERS I, II AND III AND THEIR RESPECTIVE ENDNOTES
(WHICH DID NOT INCLUDE THE LAST ENDNOTES TO CHAPTER III)
I ALTERED THE INTRODUCTION AND SOME NOTES (E.G., NOTE 68),
AND MOVED CHAPTER IV, WHICH WAS THE FIRST CHAPTER OF VOL. II
AND WHICH PROFESSOR WOODWORD HAD NOT CORRECTED,
INTO THIS VOLUME, OF WHICH IT IS NOW THE LAST CHAPTER
(THE ENDNOTES TO CHAPTER IV HAVE NOT BEEN
REVISED AT ALL, EVEN BY THE AUTHOR).

THEREFORE THIS VERSION OF THIS VOLUME
SHOULD NOT BE REGARDED AS DEFINITIVE.

Elías Capriles

BEYOND BEING
BEYOND MIND
BEYOND HISTORY

A DZOGCHEN-FOUNDED
METATRANSPERSONAL, METAPOSTMODERN
PHILOSOPHY AND PSYCHOLOGY
FOR SURVIVAL AND AN AGE OF COMMUNION

VOLUME I

BEYOND BEING:

A METAPHENOMENOLOGICAL
ELLUCIDATION OF THE PHENOMENON OF BEING,
THE BEING OF THE SUBJECT
AND THE BEING OF OBJECT

Composition courtesy of: Center for Studies on Africa and Asia,
Faculty of Humanities and Education,
University of the Andes,
Mérida, Venezuela

Composed in Times New Roman 12.

Title: Beyond Being, Beyond Mind, Beyond History:
A Dzogchen-Founded Metatranspersonal, Metapostmodern
Philosophy and Psychology for Survival in Communion

Author: Elias-Manuel Capriles-Arias

(Originally written in English by the author.)

Provisional version published on the author's websites,
provided by Shang Shung Institute, Arcidosso, GR, Italy
and the University of The Andes in Mérida, Venezuela.

Version 1.3

This book is dedicated to:

The dharmakaya, true Teacher of humankind
and original, single source of spontaneous liberation;

HH Dudjom Rinpoche and Dungse Thinle Norbu Rinpoche,
who dispensed the teachings that allow spontaneous liberation
to occur regularly in the context of Dzogchen practice;

HH Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche, who bestowed so many
Empowerments and the strength of whose Contemplation
provided such an effective help for spontaneous liberation;

Chögyäl Namkhai Norbu, who has most effectively herded
this practitioner since 1986 and provided the teachings
necessary for writing what had to be written,
and whom I hope will provide the teachings still needed;

And also:

Chadräl Rinpoche, Dodrub Chen Rinpoche, HH Pema Norbu Rinpoche
and several other important Masters, who bestowed
transmissions, lungs, teachings and/or assistance;

Khenchen Thrangu Rinpoche, who dispensed the first teaching
on Dzogchen and engaged in important dharma conversations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME I:
A METAPHENOMENOLOGICAL ELLUCIDATION OF PHENOMENON OF BEING, THE BEING OF THE SUBJECT AND THE BEING OF OBJECTS

PREAMBLE:
BUDDHISM AND DZOGCHEN

PART I:
BEYOND BEING:
A METAPHENOMENOLOGICAL METAONTOLOGY

PART II
BEYOND MIND I:
AN ELUCIDATION OF THE BEING OF THE SUBJECT
AND THE BEING OF OBJECTS

VOLUME II:
BEYOND MIND:
A METAPHENOMENOLOGICAL, METAEXISTENTIAL PHILOSOPHY, AND A METATRANSPERSONAL METAPSYCHOLOGY

PART III
BEYOND MIND II:
METAEXISTENTIAL PHILOSOPHY AND
METATRANSPERSONAL PSYCHOLOGY

VOLUME III:
BEYOND HISTORY:
A DEGENERATIVE PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY LEADING TO A GENUINE POSTMODERNITY

PART IV
BEYOND HISTORY:
A METAPOSTMODERN PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY AND REFLECTIONS ON THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

INTRODUCTION

Georges Sorel wrote that human beings act under the influence of myths, that the sciences are myths, and that the scientific pretensions of Marxism responded to the force of the myth of science, which prevailed in Marx's time.[a] I would not deny that, in spite of Hume's law ("we are not entitled to extrapolate regularities observed in limited numbers of cases to the totality of possible cases"), the sciences are in general capable of predicting *some types of* occurrences with a considerable degree of reliability, as well as of producing predictable *immediate* effects. However, Thomas Kuhn[b] showed that scientific theories and paradigms that at one point are regarded as indubitable truth are contradicted by a number of observations, which scientists consistently overlook until they become so abundant and conspicuous that they can no longer be ignored. At this point new theories and paradigms have to be devised in order to account for them—which, however, are also contradicted by a number of observations, so that the process in question repeats itself again and again. Hence Karl Popper was right in noting that, if no experience contradicts a theory, scientists are entitled to adopt it *provisionally* as a *probable* truth (thus admitting that no scientific theory can be completely substantiated), and in warning that the acceptance of a new theory gives rise to as many problems as it solved.[c] In his turn, Paul K. Feyerabend[d] showed scientific "discoveries" and theories to be very often arrived at *by breaking the procedural rules of science*. More important, however, is the fact that the current ecological crisis, which unless radical change be achieved in both the human psyche and human society will disrupt the latter within the current century and likely lead to the extinction of our species, has evidenced that the technological application of the sciences in the long run gives rise to effects contrary to the ones they are allegedly intended to produce. Thus insofar as the sciences involve a pretension of truth in the sense of exact correspondence of their maps to the territory of the given, as well as the pretension of improving our lives and producing a technological paradise, it is clear that they are metanarratives involving the denial of their character as metanarratives, and that they must be denounced as being sheer myths: they are elements of the myth of progress of *bourgeois* modernity,[1] which ecological crisis has proved, not merely to be unrealizable, but to be outright deadly. (A lengthier discussion of this subject is featured in the third volume of this book.)

Alfred Korzybski[e] asserted sanity to lie in the structural fit between our reactions to the world and what is actually going on in the world, and insanity to consist in the lack of

---

[a] Sorel (1903, 1906, 1908). Sorel's apology of violence is to be rejected.
[b] Kunh (1970).
[c] Popper (1961).
[d] Feyerabend (1982, 1984, 1987).
[e] Korzybski (4th Ed. 5th printing, 1973).

such fit: the maps of science are not the territory, and yet he believed that when maps are correct they have a structure similar to that of the territory that allows them to be useful in dealing with the latter—this structural fit being the index of sanity. However, conceptual maps, insofar as they are digital, cannot match exactly the analog territory of the given, and insofar as they are produced by fragmentary consciousness, cannot respond to the holistic territory they interpret; therefore, the belief that the maps of science match the territory of the given in a precise way is a gross error. In fact, in terms of Korzybski's criterion we can but come to a conclusion contrary to his own and view the current ecological crisis as the index of a brand of insanity having as its core the basic human delusion Buddhism calls *avidya* (Tib. marigpa[a]), which in terms of my reading of Heraclitus roughly corresponds to what the Ephesian thinker called *lethe*, and which, on the basis of the illusion of an exact fit between our conceptual maps and the territory of the given, produced the sciences, which are therefore believed to discover "truths," and the project of modernity, which pretends to use the technology produced on the basis of the sciences to mold the universe according to human whims.

But what exactly is this *avidya* or marigpa? This is something that will be discussed throughout this book. For the time being, suffice to say that it involves: (1) the concealment of the unthinkable (Skt. *achintya*), nonconceptual (Skt. *nishprapancha*) true condition of the whole of reality (first sense of *avidya* in the Dzogchen teachings); (2) the illusion of there being a host of entities existing inherently, independently and disconnectedly (second sense of the term in these teachings); and (3) a delusion involving the incapability to realize the illusion indicated as (2) to be such (third sense of the term). It must be noted that the last two depend on the combination of: (1) the baseless, illusory subject-object duality, (2) the hermetic focus of awareness that isolates from the rest of the sensory field whatever it singles out within it, and (3) our confusion of the digital, fragmentary maps of thought with the analog, holistic territory of the given that such maps are incapable of matching, and the mistaken belief in the perfect correspondence of the one and the other.

As shown in the initial chapters of this volume and in other works by the present author,[b] centuries and millennia before ecological crisis was evident, those Sages who had rid themselves of *avidya* or marigpa, aware that it was the source of the unremitting lack of plenitude and dissatisfaction that haunt us, of the frustration and pain that constantly recur in our lives, and of evil, ugliness, untruth and so on (and, as indicated by the ancient myths warning against taking the road of "progress" discussed in vol. III of this book, aware as well that in the long run it would produce the crisis we currently face), bequeathed us a host of *skillful means* effective for eradicating it. In Buddhism in general and Dzogchen in particular, a preliminary means to this end consists in "listening" to a global, all-embracing metanarrative that, unlike those of most religions and philosophies, and unlike those of science, acknowledges its character as a metanarrative. In fact, Mahayana Buddhism notes that the development of the *prajñaparamita*[c] or *wisdom that leads beyond samsara* begins with *hearing,* which consists in learning and studying the metanarrative corresponding to this vehicle; that it continues with *reflecting* on what one has heard, which is compared to using mercury to verify that gold is truly gold; and that it further continues with *applying* traditional methods for overcoming the confusion of map and territory. The latter—which

[a] *ma rig pa*.
[b] Capriles (1977, 1986, 1994, 2000a, 2003 and many other works).
[c] Tib. *shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa*.

all higher Buddhist vehicles and schools, beginning from the Madhyamaka School of the Mahayana, entreat us to accomplish—frees us from what the Prasangika Madhyamaka calls *own mind*, consisting in the illusion, inherent in *avidya* / marigpa, that some conceptual maps correspond precisely to the territory of the given whereas others do not; therefore, it makes us stop mistaking for objective truths the metanarratives produced by the Buddhist teachers of the past who rid themselves of *own-mind* as well as those that we ourselves may produce, both of which are tissues of what Prasangika Madhyamaka calls *other-directed assertions*[a]—and as such they acknowledge themselves to be no more than signposts that point the way beyond taking conceptual maps as objective truths and confusing them with the territory they interpret. In fact, these metanarratives are part of what early Mahayana Buddhist Sage Ashvagosha (first-second centuries CE) was referring to when he asserted, "we must use words in order to go beyond words:"[b] just as a nail used to extract another nail is not to be left *in situ*, in terms of a well-known Buddhist image, the system we require must be like a boat that is to be discarded once we reach the other shore, or, in terms of Wittgenstein's image, like a ladder that is to be left behind after climbing through it[c]—which in Buddhist terms implies one no longer takes it to be in itself a ladder. Thus it is not correct to believe the *prajñaparamita* or *wisdom leading beyond* [delusion and *samsara*] as interpreted by the Madhyamaka school of philosophy to entail circumscribing philosophy to the *reductio ad absurdum* (Skt. *prasanga*; Tib. thalgyur[d]) of the assertions made by others and thus abstaining from positing "autonomous [theses and] syllogisms" (Skt. *swatantraprayoga*; Tib. ranggyukyi jorwa[e]). K. Venkata Ramanan expresses in the following passage the view in this regard expressed in the *Prajñaparamitashastra*, which the Chinese attribute to the founder of Madhyamaka, the incomparable Nagarjuna:[f2]

> (The Madhyamika's) rejection of views does not mean that he is opposed to building systems; he would himself formulate specific systems, not to cling to them, but to use them as a help to those who are in need of them.[3]

The ancient objection to so-called "irrationalism" Habermas had in mind when he spoke of "the paradoxes of a self-contradictory negation of reason's capacity for truth"[g] does not apply to the above insofar as the negation of "reason's capacity for truth" is not inteded to stand as truth, but merely to endow us with the confidence that would allow us to apply the traditional yogic methods that result in the nonconceptual realization of the true condition of reality—which involves the certainty, both of the fact that one has reached the *absolute truth*, and of the fact that conceptual understanding produces pseudotruths only. It is because we are under the hypnotic spell that makes us take conceptual maps as truths or untruths, that we fall under the hypnotic spell of the explanations that show them not to do so—an error which is indispensable if we are to *initiate the process* of undoing the original hypnotic spell, but which alone cannot lead us beyond error and delusion, for this can only be achieved with the help of traditional methods for undoing hypnotic spells (to some

[a] Tib. *gzhan ngo khas len*. Cf. Capriles (2005); Chöphel (2005).
[b] Suzuki (1900).
[c] Wittgenstein (1968).
[d] *thal 'gyur*.
[e] *rang rgyud kyi sbyor ba*.
[f] Venkata Ramanan (1966, p. 42).
[g] Habermas (1987).

degree comparable to a hypnotist's finger snap). Undoing the spell amounts to ridding ourselves of *own mind*, and thus being able to produce and diffuse, as *other-directed assertions*, metanarratives that acknowledge their character as metanarratives and that aim at eradicating *avidya*-marigpa, at preventing the destruction of our species and of all life on the planet, and at setting the conditions that would permit the transition to a New Age of plenitude and harmony.

The need for the last two tasks is due to the fact that, since the current ecological crisis has made our lives miserable and put our survival at stake, we must choose between two paths: one of ever-increasing suffering leading to short-term extinction, and one which would create the conditions of possibility of the survival of our species and of the transition to an Age of communion, plenitude, equality, harmony, ecological balance and fulfillment. (I am not using the term Communion in the sense given it by Gilligan [1982], Tannen [1990], Wilber [1995, 1998], etc., but in that of "dissolution of the illusory boundaries separating people, in the unconcealment of Dzogchen *qua* Base"—which I believe was its original meaning.) The latter would involve a twofold revolution: (1) an inner one, which would radically transform perception and consciousness, eradicating the delusion called *avidya* or marigpa, and (2) an outer one that would radically transform our economic conceptions and systems, political and social organization, culture, science, technology and so on. The metanarrative expounded in the three volumes of this book is intended to, (a) foster awareness that we stand at this crossroads, and (b) set forth the bases—philosophical, psychological and so on—for the multidimensional, total revolution that would permit human survival and the shift to the New Age. The first of these tasks, undertaken in vol. III of this book, entailed explaining from the standpoint of the current state of affairs and present day philosophy and knowledge the ancient myth that posits successive time cycles or *aeons* (Greek, *aion*; Skt. *kalpa*; Tib. kalpa[a]), each of them involving a process of human spiritual and social degeneration starting with an Age of Perfection, Era of Truth (in the sense of lack of the delusion called *avidya*) or Golden Age, and ending with an Era of Darkness or Iron Age—in terms of which the modern myth of progress is seen as a result of the exacerbation of the basic human delusion in the later part of the final Age of the present cycle. The second of these tasks entailed explaining the nature and dynamics of the basic human delusion, both from an ontological perspective (vol. I and ch. 1 of vol. II) and from a psychological one (rest of vol. II); describing the way in which this delusion can be eradicated (ch. 1 of vol. I and ch. 2 through last of vol. II); and providing some guidelines as to the way to be followed if we are to give rise to an egalitarian, frugal society harmoniously integrated with the rest of the ecosphere rather than engaged in a mortal struggle against it (vol. III).

Before the final decades of the twentieth century, no grand systems showing the myth of "progress" to be unjustified were produced, probably because only in the present nightfall of the aeon, when events of the long day in question have drawn to a close, has Athena's owl seen all that it needed to see for understanding the day's evolution—and only at this point is it no longer dazzled by the daylight. This not being dazzled stands for the "systemic wisdom"[b] of those who have repeatedly gone beyond delusion and Seen into the true condition of reality, from which the owl can now draw in order to produce clear and precise metanarratives interpreting human spiritual and social evolution and history as a

---

[a] *kal pa*; *bskal pa*.
[b] Bateson (1972).

gradual development of the basic human delusion called *avidya* or marigpa to a threshold lying at the very end of the Era of Darkness or Iron Age, at which this delusion completes its *reductio ad absurdum* and can disconnect itself, restoring communion—which in its turn would restore plenitude, equality, harmony, ecological balance and fulfillment.[4] In fact, only systemic wisdom, resulting from the repeated manifestation of the state of Truth as defined in this book—i.e., as lack of the *avidya* or marigpa involving the fragmentary perception and understanding of reality produced by the combination of the hermetic focus of awareness with the confusion of map and territory—can respond to the deadly disease affecting our species and the whole of the ecosphere by producing wholesome myths of the kind Sorel called *authentic*, expressed in systemic metanarratives that drive human beings to take the courses of action the present situation of our species and planet demand,[5] and that acknowledge their mythic character, challenging us to cease confusing them with the territory they represent. In fact, it is insofar as such systemic metanarratives are intended to lead beyond clinging to systems, myths and metanarratives (whether global or local, systemic or fragmentary, beneficial or detrimental) that, giving a stricter sense to a term coined by Georges Sorel, I call them *anti-systems*.

However, in our time a rich pseudophilosophical fauna that, partially disenchanted with the ideals of modernity, labels itself "postmodern," justifiably denounces the grand "philosophical" systems of the West as baseless attempts at gaining a metaphysical illusion of order and meaning, and those of modernity, in particular, as baseless justifications of the myth of progress and perfecting—as a consequence of which they ban grand, universal metanarratives and accept only fragmentary, local *petit récits*.[a] However, contrarily to the narratives produced by Awake Ones (whether grand and involving autonomous theses and syllogisms, or small and limited to the *reductio ad absurdum* of the theses others posit), the *petit récits* with which these writers profess to provide an alternative to the pretension of absolute truth of the grand "philosophical" metanarratives of the past are a function of the basic human delusion called *avidya* or marigpa, that as such involve *own mind* and thus are *interior-directed assertions*[b] they wrongly take for the absolute truth regarding the territory they interpret—thus perpetuating what is the true pivotal error of the grand metanarratives against which they are reacting. Moreover, it is insofar as their fragmentary perception does not allow them to obtain a global grasp of our situation, that they confine themselves to the elaboration of fragmentary, local *petit récits*—which as such perpetuate the fragmentary perspective that is at the root of ecological crisis. Worse still, most specimens of this fauna are to such extent conditioned by the wayward, detrimental myths leading us down the road to self-destruction (which, like most members of our species, they fail to realize to be mere myths), that they do not even question the way of life based on big industry, destructive technology and unrestrained consumption that constitutes the actual essence of modernity, and disdain whatever alternative myths may have the potential of restoring wholesomeness and leading to a genuine postmodernity. In particular, pseudo-postmodern "philosophers" who are on the right of the political spectrum ban those metanarratives pointing the way to a harmonious, egalitarian human society on the grounds that they are part of the project of modernity that has been surpassed—thus sustaining the *status quo* that is the very essence of modernity and preventing it from being surpassed.

---

[a] French for "small narratives."

[b] *rang rgyud du khes len pa*. Cf. Capriles (2005); Chöphel (2005).

The above errors prevent the writers in question from realizing that the collapse of modernity constitutes the *reductio ad absurdum* of the delusion affecting all of us and of the myths and the way of life they cling to: like a person with jaundice, they see white conch shells as yellow—yet rather than taking medicine to cure their illness, they write *petit récits* about yellow shells in order to maintain the present state of affairs. Furthermore, even if they were able to see that we all suffer from a disease, insofar as this disease affects perception, it would make it impossible for them to properly diagnose it—and since they have neither experience nor understanding of the Path leading beyond *avidya* or marigpa, were they able to diagnose it, they would be unable to prescribe a proper cure for it. They are like sparrows flying in the dusk of the aeon that, on the top of having their vision impaired by the night blindness characteristic of their species, wore blinders causing them to perceive only fragments of the continuum of the physis and of the closely knitted web of life—which they would thus take to be entities inherently separate and disconnected from the rest of the continuum. (It must be acknowledged, however, that insofar as such thinkers cannot go beyond the confusion of conceptual maps with the territory of the given, it is very fortunate that they do not produce grand metanarratives: would they do so, they would incur in the error of systemic thinkers of modernity such as Hegel and take them for the ultimate global truth.)

In order for our species to move into a New Age of communion, plenitude, equality, harmony, ecological balance and fulfillment, a sufficient number of its members would have to work on manifold fields—and particularly in the spiritual-psychological, the social-economic-political, the cultural, the environmental, and the scientific-technological. Prime among these fields, however, is the spiritual-psychological, in which we must set out to work toward eradicating the basic human delusion discussed above—which, as we have seen, is the ultimate source of the deadly human-induced crisis affecting the whole of the ecosphere and human society, and which, as we have also seen, prevents us from seeing that we suffer from an illness, diagnosing it and prescribing a cure for it. However, among those who admit that the root of our problems lies in our state of mind and perceptual perspective, and who claim to be working to take us beyond confinement to a hylotropic, merely personal outlook by opening our minds to a transpersonal-holotropic perspective, most are just as deluded as the rest, and have neither true experience nor genuine understanding of the Path that progressively eradicates delusion: though some of them are aware that the conch shell is white and that their vision of it as yellow is an effect of their jaundice, they prescribe drugs that harm their liver, worsening their condition, and then pretend their yellow vision to be white, thus coming to feel superior to the common of mortals in the belief that they have become healthy. This is the basic shortcoming of most of transpersonal and so-called “integral” psychology.

The point is that the only doctor who knows how to cure the illness being discussed is the one who has fully cured him or herself from it. In the Buddhist teaching of the Four Noble Truths, even though the Path is the precondition of *nirvana* and as such should be mentioned first, *nirvana* or Awakening is the Third Truth, whereas the Path toward *nirvana* or Awakening is the Fourth Truth. In fact, a Path that, rather than being the outcome of Awakening, is conceived by deluded mind, will necessarily affirm, sustain and consolidate the delusion it is supposed to eradicate: if we mistake the East for the West, the more we move toward what we fancy to be the East, the more to the West we find ourselves. This is the error of most transpersonal and integral psychologists, and it is the reason why we need traditional Paths and methods taught by those who definitively rid themselves of delusion

by attaining full Awakening, regardless of the label these Paths may bear. However, among such Paths, I find the Buddhist ones most appropriate for our time insofar as they do not posit a god or other religious or metaphysical abstractions, and instead propound a critical attitude, as evidenced by the following words of the *Kalama Sutra*:

> Do not believe in the strength of traditions, however much they may have been honored for many generations and in many places; do not believe anything because many people speak of it; do not believe in the power of sages of old times; do not believe that which you yourselves have imagined, thinking that a god has inspired you. Believe nothing that depends solely on the authority of your teachers or priests. After investigation, believe that which you yourselves have tested and found reasonable, and that is for your good and that of others.

Thus Nietzsche was not wholly off the mark when he wrote:[a]

> Buddhism is a hundred times as realistic as Christianity—it is part of its living heritage that it is able to face problems objectively and coolly; it is the product of long centuries of philosophical speculation. The concept, "god," was already disposed of before it appeared. Buddhism is the only genuinely *positive* religion to be encountered in history, and this applies even to its epistemology (which is a strict phenomenalism). It does not speak of a "struggle with sin," but, yielding to reality, of the "struggle with suffering." Sharply differentiating itself from Christianity, it puts the self-deception that lies in moral concepts behind it; it is, in my phrase, *beyond* good and evil.

Nietzsche erred, however, in asserting Buddhism to have arisen *after the disposal* of the concept of god, and in asserting it to be the *only* genuinely positive religion in history. In fact, theism arose just before the transition to the Neolithic, and still in our time there are nontheistic, phenomenalistic religions other than Buddhism—such as Taoism and Bön. At any rate, in the experience of the writer of this book, and according to the teachings of the Nyingmapa and the statements of the greatest Tibetan masters, it is the Path of Dzogchen *Atiyoga* that is most direct and powerful, and responds best to the needs of our time[b]—which amounts to the same, for only the most direct Path, involving the most powerful methods, can be effective at a time when delusion has reached the zenith of its power. And though this Path is not confined to Buddhism, this writer has studied it and practiced it in its Buddhist variety—and hence it will be in this variety that it will be discussed in this book.

In other works, I dealt in greater or lesser detail with the structure and function of the Dzogchen Path,[c] with the various schools of Buddhist philosophy,[d] with the identities and differences between Western and Buddhist philosophy and psychology,[e] and with the deep causes of the present crisis, as well as with the "rights" and "wrongs" of some systems of political and economic philosophy as means for helping achieve the transformation that would make the survival of humankind and the transition to the New

---

[a] Nietzsche (1920).

[b] This includes H.H. the 14th Dalai Lama (teachings in London organized by Sogyal Rinpoche in the second half of the nineteen eighties).

[c] Capriles (2000a, 2003, in print 1).

[d] Capriles (2004, 2005). The definitive version of Capriles (2004) will be available in print as soon as it is ready.

[e] Capriles (1977, 1986, 1994 and many other works).

Age possible.[a] The three volumes of the present book further elucidate[6] the philosophy—and in particular the ontology and philosophy of history—and the psychology explicit or implicit in Buddhism in general and Dzogchen *Atiyoga* in particular, by conscientiously contrasting them with Western systems of philosophy and psychology, and in particular with those that either make reference to their Buddhist or Dzogchen counterparts, or that have been the object of well-known comparisons with these. In particular, the philosophical and psychological anti-system developed in this book responds to the distortions that, with regard to the Path of Awakening in general and to the various Buddhist systems in particular, were introduced by Western Buddhologists (in particular those who intended to explain Buddhism, and in particular the Path of Dzogchen Atiyoga, in terms of concepts and methods drawn from the phenomenological and existential traditions),[7] by so-called "New Age philosophers," and by transpersonal and "integral" psychologists—including some who studied with Dzogchen Masters and claim to practice Dzogchen. Thus this book had to respond to the manifold distortions and confusions such authors introduced, by contrasting their philosophies and psychologies with those of Buddhism and Dzogchen.

However, I must make it clear that I acknowledge the valuable contributions to the study of the human mind and experience made by both antipsychiatry and transpersonal / "integral" psychology, which have vindicated realms of experience that psychology and psychiatry formerly regarded as pathological—and especially the condition that, according to Buddhism in general and Dzogchen in particular, constitutes True Sanity (i.e. that which Buddhists call Awakening). Moreover, in my youth I was deeply influenced by the work of Gregory Bateson, Ronald Laing and David Cooper (the last two of whom are generally regarded as the originators of antipsychiatry);[8] and though I have never accepted the views of Ken Wilber, and I cannot endorse those of Stan Grof or any other of the beacons of the Transpersonal movement, I think their work has given rise to an open, well fertilized field of interest and research, as well as to a wide group of researchers and sympathizers—which is the reason why I decided transpersonal thought must be part of the metanarrative, having as its pivot the structure and function of genuine Wisdom traditions, to be expounded in this book. (In particular, I regard the Grofs' foundation of the SEN [Spiritual Emergency Network]—just as Laing and Cooper's creation of the Arbours Association—as a most commendable achievement, for such networks certainly provide a potentially therapeutic alternative to the psychiatrization of those who go through spiritual crises outside the context of traditional spiritual systems.)

In short, this book offers, as an alternative to the metanarratives that contribute to the unfolding of ecological crisis and human misery, what I deem to be a wholesome narrative which, avoiding metaphysical fictions as well as the claim to truth, responds to the needs of our time. This narrative denounces the misinterpretation by pseudo-postmodern philosophers both of the meaning of "postmodernity" and of the necessities of our time, and shows that the genuine postmodernity can only begin when, after the end of the current dark age and hence of the present time cycle, which we are now reaching, the primordial condition is restored, so that the belief in progress and the wayward patterns resulting from the growth of delusion throughout the time cycle be eradicated, Communion becomes again easily accessible to all, and socioeconomic and political equality, plenitude in frugality, and collaboration with the rest of the ecosphere are reestablished. At the same

[a] Capriles (1994 and other works, including 1986).

time, it rectifies the misrepresentations of the teachings of Buddhism and Dzogchen and of their relation with Western philosophy and psychology produced by Western scholars, while sketching a comprehensive (anti-)system of philosophy and psychology in agreement with the views of Buddhism and Dzogchen.

The Buddha-Dharma is alive and well today because, throughout its history, practitioner-theorists denounced what they perceived as distortions, and open, all-out debate was encouraged: each part explicitly named the other and listed its views, and then proceeded to refute them. No doubt, this often led to sterile philosophical elaboration and resulted in the proliferation of merely theoretical schools. However, even more often, it allowed Buddhists to see distortions for what they were, helping them keep to the true Path. Furthermore, at no point did this lead to set up a Congregation of the Faith to decide upon the orthodoxy or heterodoxy of doctrines, or to prevent innovation when the ancient doctrines were to be taught in new cultural environments. The Dzogchen teachings, in particular, have a tradition of doctrinal autonomy (since no rigid official dogmas were established, no one ever grumbled when one Master contradicted another) and of spiritual freedom in re-elaborating the basic doctrines according to the needs of time and place. However, not everyone has the capacity to do this, and so it is up to the great Masters who are universally recognized as such to come to an agreement as to what culture-inspired innovations are in accord with the spirit and the essence of the tradition, and which contradict them. I lay this book before their eyes for them to decide whether or not it fulfills its avowed aims.

The Sources of this Work

The fact that I have tried to establish the Dzogchen view in terms of the knowledge and the culture of the West, and that I have set out to refute interpretations of Dzogchen in terms of Western culture that I consider to be wrong, does not mean I privilege institutional study and abstract intellectual constructions. Though I have studied Buddhism for four decades, I have never done so in an institutional framework. In fact, in the early seventies I dropped out of University, and then traveled to the Indian subcontinent, where I lived from 1973 to 1983. Once there, I declined an offer to study Buddhism and Tibetan culture formally in Vishwabharati University (Shantiniketan, West Bengal, India), and went into strict retreat in cabins and caves in the Himalayas to practice Dzogchen—where I stayed most of the time during nearly six years, until December 1982. My practice compounded with my informal studies of Buddhism and with both my formal and informal studies of Western disciplines, spontaneously giving rise to a global vision that contrasted with aspects of some of the systems produced by Western scholars to which reference was made above, and so with the passing of time I found myself elaborating a comprehensive, yet detailed anti-system of thought which made these contrasts explicit, and which I believe may help guide our species on the path to survival in a New Age of plenitude, harmony and fulfillment.

Since I referred to my Dzogchen practice, I may as well list its sources. Concerning wangs[a], from H. H. Dudjom Rinpoche I received those of Dudjom Lingpa's[b] Treasures and

[a] *dbang*.
[b] *bdud 'joms gling pa*.

of the *Dudjom Tersar*[a]; from H. H. Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche, those of the *Rinchen Terdzö*[b] and a few other collections of Treasures;[c] and from Dödrub Chen Rinpoche, those of Jigme Lingpa's *Longchen Nyingthik*[d]. With regard to the instructions for the practice, I received pith instructions for the practice of Tekchö[e] in the context of the Thubthik[f] from Dungse Thinle Norbu Rinpoche on the basis of Dudjom Rinpoche's *Richö*[g], and strict instructions on how to carry out my retreat from Dudjom Rinpoche. I applied these teachings in a series of strict retreats, and later on I studied the Nyingthik[h] teachings in Jigme Lingpa's *Lion's Roar*[i], with regard to which I received clarifications individually from Dödrub Chen Rinpoche. I also received Dzogchen teachings individually from Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche, and collectively from Chögyäl Namkhai Norbu. These teachings compounded in my practice in successive retreats, so that my years of strict retreat in the Himalayas were devoted the practice of the Thubthik / Nyingthik, as well as to that of an Anuyoga *dakini sadhana* belonging to the Dudjom Tersar. Back in Venezuela, in 1986, having accepted the invitation I had extended him, Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche visited the country, establishing the International Dzogchen Community there. Ever since, beside my regular main practice of the Thubthik / Nyingthik, I have applied the practices with form of the Dzogchen Community—and, occasionally, some Yangthik[j] practice on the basis of pith instructions received from Chögyal Namkhai Norbu. Thus in this lifetime I have practiced the Dzogchen Atiyoga for nearly thirty years. However, I am far from regarding myself as an accomplished Dzogchen practitioner, for a true Dzogchenpa does never become distracted during his or her daily activities.

Despite the fact that study has never been my priority, and that this book, rather than being intended solely for specialists, is intended for all human beings who may admit that survival and human fulfillment require a multidimensional radical change, in order to make the book's message be taken seriously I had to write it at the level of complexity of the philosophical and psychological works respected by the Western academy. However, since my aim was to convey a message I deem most important for everyone in our time to assimilate, I did my best to express it as clearly as possible—taking a course contrary to the one Schelling pointed out to Hegel when he told him that, in order to be successful, he should make his texts more obscure (for this, as the philosophical *vedettes* of our time know well, tends to provoke the readers' wonder before what they perceive as being high above their intellectual capacity). Furthermore, in order to make the book comprehensible to the average reader, I explain most of the specialized concepts I use the very moment I introduce them. (If, despite these efforts, some readers find any of the sections of the book too difficult, and yet feel attracted by the titles of other sections listed in the Table of Contents, I advise them to switch to the sections they find interesting. If the interest

---

[a] *bdud 'joms gter gsar*: the "New Treasure of Dudjom" revealed by Jigdräl Yeshe Dorje.
[b] *rin chen gter mdzod*.
[c] *klong chen rab 'byams pa*'s *mkha' 'gro snying thig, ya bzhi*; *jigs med gling pa*'s *thugs gter klong chen snying thig gzhung rtsa ba gsal byed dang bcas pa*; and *chos gling gar dbang 'chi med rdo rje*'s collection of termas.
[d] *thugs gter klong chen snying thig gzhung rtsa ba gsal byed dang bcas pa*
[e] *khregs chod*.
[f] *thugs thig*.
[g] *ri chos bslab bya nyams len dmar khrid go bder brjod pa grub pa'i bcud len*
[h] *snying thig*.
[i] *seng ge'i nga ro*.
[j] *yang thig*.

aroused by those sections makes them want to go back into the sections they originally found too difficult, their enhanced interest may make it easier for them to persevere with the sections they originally found too complicated.)

It should be clear by now that Buddhist Tantrism and Dzogchen assume that the Primordial Age and the upcoming New Age are somehow analogous in being characterized by Communion, harmony, plenitude, equality and so on, so that in *neither* of them is human existence characterized by the unremitting lack of plenitude and dissatisfaction, and the recurrent pain and frustration, that the Buddha Shakyamuni called *duhkha*. Likewise, we must assume that in the Ages in question the basic condition of the human individual did *not* consist in the experiences that Kierkegaard referred to as despair, *Angst*, "fear and trembling," etc.[a] or in the experience of *Angst* as manifest in what Heidegger called "being toward the end,"[b] or in what Sartre called *angoise*, *nausée* and so on[c]—which presently determine the whole of our existence insofar as both our inner life and our external conduct are characterized by the set of strategies whereby we attempt to elude them. Therefore, the reader should bear in mind that, although the Buddhist-inspired descriptions of human existence as being pervaded by *duhkha* and the [meta]existential[9] identification of the being of the human individual with the experience of *hell* which are found throughout this book may seem to refer to a timeless essence of humankind, they refer in their totality to the present condition of our species. Since it would have been disruptive to constantly remind the reader of this fact throughout the descriptions and explanations in question, I decided to include this caveat in the Introduction.

The Title and the Divisions of this Book

This book acquired its present structure as a result of the history of its development, which I briefly discuss in an endnote.[10] (1) In its title, the words "Beyond Being" refer to Part I, which consists of chapters II and III, in which I outline what I have called a metaphenomenological metaontology,[11] together with Part II, which consists in chapter IV, where I elucidate the mode of being of the subject and the objects, which Sartre referred to by the traditional labels being-for-Self and being-in-itself. Together with the Introduction and chapter I—which constitutes a Preamble providing a condensed portrayal of Buddhism and Dzogchen for the readers having no background in these disciplines—Parts I and II make up the first volume of the book. (2) The phrase "Beyond Mind" refers to Parts II and III. We have already discussed Part II, which, since it deals with ontology, was included in vol. I. Part III, which constitutes the second volume of the book, includes chapters V through VII, where I delineate what I have called a "metaexistential philosophy," as well as what I have called a "metatranspersonal metapsychology."[12] (3) Finally, "Beyond History" refers to Part III, which sketches a degenerative philosophy of history pointing the way to human survival and the transition to the genuine postmodernity that will consist in the above discussed New Age—which, as observed above, at the individual level, requires that we rid ourselves of delusion, and, at the level of the species, requires that we drop what Gregory Bateson referred to as "conscious purpose against nature" and surpass the unequal

[a] Kierkegaard (1968, 1970).
[b] Heidegger (1996).
[c] Sartre (1980).

and wayward forms of social organization prevailing in our time. Together with the Bibliography for all three volumes, Part III makes up the third volume of the book.

With regard to the book's subtitles, the term *metatranspersonal* implicitly rebukes transpersonal psychology (within which I include Ken Wilber's "integral" psychology) for overlooking the fact that there are samsaric transpersonal states, transpersonal states that are neither samsaric nor nirvanic, and nirvanic transpersonal states—and that only *nirvana* may constitute the ultimate aim of psychological and spiritual therapy.[13] In fact, the main distortion I find in some of the most renowned systems of transpersonal psychology lies in the fact that they identify transpersonal states in general with sanity and make of the production of such states an end in itself, rather than viewing them—as do the systems I call "metatranspersonal," such as Dzogchen and in general the higher forms of Buddhism, of Bön, of Sufism, of Shaivism, of Taoism and so on—as opportunities for applying pith instructions that may result in the manifestation of what which the Dzogchen teachings call rigpa and which corresponds to *nirvana*.

In its turn, the term *metapostmodern* was coined in response to the views of the minor philosophers who declare themselves "postmodern" and who identify the present period of modernity as "postmodernity," while in truth both their views and the current period represent the decadence of modernity, in which members of Western civilization and its sphere of influence have become increasingly disillusioned with the ideals and expectations of modernity, but still live and think on the basis of the "achievements" and ideals of this period, which they are not at all willing to give up—but which must be given up if our species is to survive and the true Postmodernity of the New Age is to start. At the same time, the term "metapostmodern" makes it clear that, as already noted, this book rejects the postmodern straightjacket that compels narratives to be local, fragmentary *petit récits*.[14]

The use of the term *metaphenomenology* is due to the fact that, although the phenomenological *epoche* is an essential aspect of the method of inquiry at the root of this book, Jacques Derrida was quite right in noting that phenomenology is no more than a [crypto]metaphysics,[a] and that the phenomenological emphasis on the immediacy of experience is a new illusion (though I am not sure it may correspond to the Kantian concept of "transcendental illusion"): Husserl takes as a foundation of his system the Cartesian *cogito*, which is a metaphysical pseudoabsolute, together with the noetic-noematic schism which pervades the dualistic immediate experience of *samsara* but which is one of the basic aspects of the fundamental human delusion the Buddha Shakyamuni called *avidya* and Heraclitus called *lethe*; Heidegger and Sartre take *being* for the absolute, failing to realize the *phenomenon of being* that throughout *samsara* pervades immediate experience to be another of the basic aspects of the fundamental human delusion, and the true nature of reality, which has neither *genus proximum* not *differentia specifica*, not to be comprehensible in terms of any of the four extremes consisting in being, nonbeing, both and neither; Sartre, like Husserl, takes for granted the subject-object duality within human experience, and metaphysically seems to assume the existence of *absolute being* as distinct from the *phenomenon of being*. These shortcomings of phenomenology can *exclusively be overcome* by a method of inquiry which, rather than basing its hermeneutics of experience solely on the phenomena of *samsara*, takes into consideration and gives primacy to the metaphenomenon / metaphenomena of *nirvana*, which show the phenomena of *samsara* to

[a] Derrida (1967).

be baseless illusions. The related term *metaontology*, in turn, refers to an ontology that, rather than being based exclusively on experience founded on the *phenomenon of being* and as a result of this mistakenly taking *being* to be *given* and to constitute the true nature of reality, is also based on the realizations that involve the dissolution of this phenomenon in *nirvana*, which demonstrate it to be a baseless, fundamental phenomenon at the core of the basic human delusion. Finally, the term *metaexistential* makes the point that, though it is true that the being of the human individual is anguish and so on, and that it is far more authentic to face the distressing experience of this being than to avoid it by means of self-deceit, the being in question is a manifestation of delusion, and true authenticity lies in the dissolution of this being in *nirvana*.

Acknowledgments and Clarifications

In the first place, I must acknowledge my debt with the Teachers without whose teachings and blessings this book would have never been written: the dharmakaya Samantabhadra, the *sambhogakaya* Vajrasattva, the *nirmanakaya* Padmasambhava, and my precious *nirmanakaya* teachers—the late Dudjom Yeshe Dorje[a], Dungse Thinley Norbu[b], the late Dilgo Khyentse[c], Namkhai Norbu, Chaträl Sangye Dorje[d], Dodrub Chen[e], Khenchen Thrangu and all the Masters who were instrumental in setting me firmly on the Dzogchen Path and providing me with the means to tread it. It is from Namkhai Norbu that I hope to receive the Dzogchen teachings that I have not yet received and which I need in order to continue to progress on the Path.

Secondly, I acknowledge my debt with the writers that made me aware of the possibility of Awakening and of the existence of a Path leading to Awakening (such as Morris West,[15] Hermann Hesse and Aldous Huxley); the authors who provided me with an initial understanding of the structure and function of the Path in question (among whom I must highlight Alan W. Watts, D. T. Suzuki, Alexandra David-Neel, W. Y. Evans-Wentz, Herbert V. Guenther and especially Chögyam Trungpa Rinpoche); those who made me relate Western psychology to the Path of Awakening (A. W. Watts,[16] C. G. Jung,[17] D. T. Suzuki and E. Fromm,[18] Gregory Bateson, Ronald Laing, David E. Cooper and H. V. Guenther); those who introduced me to different theories of social transformation (the theorists of Marxism and their anarchist critics) and their relation with the transformation of the human mind (D. E. Cooper); the ones through whom I discovered political ecology (including Ivan Illich, Edward Goldsmith and, indirectly, Arne Naess)[19] and the rapport between spirituality and ecology (Jung, Watts, John Blofeld, Aldous Huxley); and the ones that introduced me to the relationship between Marxism and Psychoanalysis (among the many, suffice to mention Erich Fromm, Wilhelm Reich, and Fromm's opponent, Herbert Marcuse). I am indebted to a constellation of other authors in these and other fields, but since it would be impossible to mention them all I decided to circumscribe myself to the ones mentioned so far. (The fact that, with the exception of the books by Trungpa

---

[a] *bdud 'joms rin po che, 'jigs 'bral ye shes rdo rje.*
[b] *phrin las nor bu rin po che.*
[c] *dil mgo mkhyen brtse rin po che.*
[d] *bya 'bral sangs rgyas rdo rje rin po che.*
[e] *rdo grub chen rin po che.*

Rinpoche, many of the works by the authors just mentioned herein have important errors and sleights-of-hand, does not in any way diminish my debt toward them.)

In the third place, I thank the late philosopher and theorist of anarchism Angel Cappelletti (Universidad Simón Bolívar, Caracas, University of the Andes, Mérida, etc.)[20] and the late political ecologist Arturo Eichler (University of the Andes, Mérida) for their sympathy and for stimulating my career as a writer. Likewise, I express my gratitude to Professor Sam Shapiro (University of Hawai‘i at Manoa) for opening to me the doors of *The International Journal of Transpersonal Studies*, for sending me a huge amount of printed matter, for his sympathy, and for unwillingly leading me to write this book. I thank Professor Douglas A. MacDonald for the review of my work he published in the *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*, for his sympathy, for suggesting publishers for this book, for the endorsement of this book he wrote for the Los Andes University Press (Consejo de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Los Andes, Mérida, Venezuela), and for his valuable collaboration in general. I express my gratitude to professor Philippe Gross for the drawing of diagrams for my paper "Beyond Mind: Steps to a Metatranspersonal Psychology,"[a] which are reproduced in vol. II of this book. Finally, I thank Professor Ian Woodword (University of The Andes at Mérida, Venezuela) for checking the English in this volume, which he did in the most conscientious and helpful way I have witnessed in my career; unfortunately, after his corrections I rewrote the Introduction, included a few paragraphs in some chapters of the regular text, and added a few notes, and hence professor Woodword may not be held responsible for whatever new faults in the English I may have introduced in this process. Likewise, I thank Mr. Mauro Sánchez and Mr. Victor Klimov, who found typing and related errors in version 1.0, the correction of which gave rise to version 1.1.

Finally, I must notify the reader that, since I wrote this book while living and teaching in Mérida, Venezuela, and since at the time my resources were limited, I had to use the texts that were available to me. Thus some quotations had to be retranslated into English from Spanish and even Italian translations of texts originally written in English, others had to be translated into English from French translations from German, and so on. I hope this will not affect in any way the quality of the final product.

[a] Capriles (2000c).

PREAMBLE

BUDDHISM AND DZOGCHEN

I

Brief Introduction to Buddhism
With an Explanation of
the Base, Path and Fruit in the Dzogchen teachings

This Chapter

As noted in the Introduction, this chapter was incorporated into this book so that those who have not read my book *Buddhism and Dzogchen* / *Volume One* / *Buddhism*: *A Dzogchen Outlook*[a] could gain an elementary understanding of the essential concepts of Buddhism and Dzogchen that I deem indispensable for understanding many of the explanations in the subsequent chapters of this book.

The Four Noble Truths: The Most Basic Teaching of Buddhism

The first teaching of Shakyamuni Buddha was that of the Four Noble Truths, which initiated the first of the three successive cycles of teachings known as the Three Promulgations (Skt. *triparivartadharmachakrapravartana*; Tib. chökhor [rimpa] sum[b]).[21] The First Promulgation consisted of the set of teachings that make up the form of Buddhism that subsequently the Mahayana referred to by the term Hinayana (a brief explanation of the vehicles and Paths of Buddhism will be provided below). In the Second Promulgation, Shakyamuni transmitted the *Prajñaparamita* teachings of the Mahayana. Finally, the Third Promulgation contained those yogic teachings belonging to the Mahayana that emphasized all that had to do with mind and experience.

The original form of the teaching on the Four Noble Truths, as codified in the *Dharmachakrapravartanasutra*[c], may be resumed in the following terms: (1) Human life is characterized by *duhkha*[d]: all-pervading lack of plenitude and dissatisfaction, and recurrent discomfort, frustration, suffering and pain. (2) The cause of dissatisfaction and suffering is *trishna*[e]: a basic craving, which is called *kama-trishna* in the case of craving for pleasure,

---

[a] Capriles (2003).
[b] *chos 'khor (rim pa) gsum*.
[c] Pali, *dhamma-chakka-pavattana sutta*.
[d] Pali, *duhkha*; Tib. *sdug bsngal*.
[e] Pali, *tanha*; Tib. *sred pa*.

bhava-trishna or thirst-for-existence in the case of the more basic compulsion to assert, confirm and maintain oneself as a (supposedly) self-existent, important, separate individual, and to fill the concomitant sensation of lack,[22] and *vibhava-trishna* when this thirst or craving turns toward self-annihilation in *nirvana*. (3) If the essential craving that is the cause of dissatisfaction and suffering is uprooted, these disappear in cessation or *nirvana*[a].[23] (4) There is a means leading to this end, which is *marga*[b]: the Path leading to the cessation of craving and of the ensuing dissatisfaction and suffering.

Though the Four Noble Truths are a characteristically Hinayana teaching, there is a Mahayana version of them, which may be summarized as follows:

(1) In both the *Hinayana* or "Narrow Vehicle" and the *Mahayana* or "Wider Vehicle" the First Truth is *duhkha*. However, in the Mahayana there is a greater focus on the suffering of others than in one's own suffering.

(2) In accord with the order of the "twelve links (*nidana*) of interdependent origination" that constitute the *pratitya samutpada,* in which the first of the twelve links is *avidya* and *trishna* is the eighth link, the Mahayana stresses the fact that the *trishna* or craving that, according to the *Hinayana*, is the Second Truth, is a consequence of *avidya* (Tib. marigpa[24]), which according to the Mahayana is the basic delusion[25] that involves unawareness of the true, single nature of all subjects and objects, as well as the illusion that all subjects and objects are self-existing, substantial entities—so that it implies wrongly taking to be independent / self-existent / substantial what is dependent / void of self-existence / insubstantial, wrongly taking to be absolute what is relative, wrongly taking to be permanent what is impermanent, wrongly taking as having the potential of providing satisfaction what is unsatisfactory, and so on.[26]

In order to understand the reason why *avidya* is the cause of *trishna* and as such is the true Second Noble Truth, we must keep in mind that the true nature of all entities, including subjects and objects, is an undivided continuum comprising both our awareness and all of its contents and having no empty spaces or gaps, which therefore may be aptly characterized in terms of completeness and plenitude (this is so, no matter whether we conceive this continuum as a physical universe and interpret it in terms of present day theories in physics,[27] whether we view the whole of reality as a continuum of "mental stuff," or whether we refuse to interpret it one way or the other[28]). The very moment there arises the illusion that a mental subject is at a distance from the sensory continuum from which objects are singled out by human perception, as a result of which we feel inherently separate from what has come to appear to be an "external dimension," the undivided whole consisting of awareness and its contents, which was characterized as a continuum of completeness and plenitude, is illusorily sundered—as a result of which the illusory mental subject experiences the lack of the completeness and plenitude that characterize the undivided whole. To sum up, the continuum is illusorily disrupted *in* and *by* our experience,[29] as a result of which our consciousness experiences the *lack of completeness and plenitude* that is the root of the basic craving or thirst that *trishna* is.

Thus it is clear that the lack of plenitude and completeness that makes up the core of *duhkha* arises as a consequence of the error or delusion called *avidya* or marigpa, once the latter manifests in the second and third of the senses the Dzogchen teachings give the term. These three senses are: (i) *avidya* or marigpa *qua* the beclouding of primordial

---

[a] Pali, *nibbana*; Tib. *mya ngan las 'das pa*.
[b] Pali, *magga*; Tib. *lam*.

awareness, or, which is the same, *qua* beclouding of the self-reGnition[30] of the true nature of all reality; (ii) *avidya* or marigpa *qua* the basic delusion consisting in taking the dependent / insubstantial as being independent / substantial / self-existent, the relative as being absolute, what lacks value and importance as having inherent value and importance,[31] the impermanent as permanent, the unsatisfactory as capable of providing satisfaction and so on; and (iii) *avidya* or marigpa *qua* the inability, so long as (ii) is active, to realize that we are under delusion.[32] The combination of these three senses may be said to make up the delusion that, in terms of the Mahayana interpretation expressed in the *Prajñaparamitasutras* (Second Promulgation). Although the term *lethe* used by the Greek philosopher Heraclitus means "concealment" and therefore strictly speaking corresponds to the first of these three senses of the term *avidya* or marigpa, I believe Heraclitus may have used the term to convey the complete meaning of the Buddhist term as explained here—and hence in the third chapter of this book I will use it as a synonym for *avidya* or marigpa, subsuming the three senses the term has in the Dzogchen teachings.

It was the delusion involving the combination of these three senses of *avidya* or marigpa that Nagarjuna, Aryadeva and subsequent Madhyamika interpreters of the Sutras of the Second Promulgation referred to as the illusion of self-existence (Skt. *swabhava*; Tib. rangzhin[a]) of entities. As we take our thoughts to perfectly correspond to an objective reality and/or we confuse them with the sense data they interpret, we come to experience a plethora of phenomena as though they were self-existent, as though they inherently possessed such and such qualities, etc. However, this is a gross delusion, for phenomena in general, whether of the type we call "mental" or of the type that we designate as "material," whether subjects or objects,[33] lack the self-existence that individuals possessed by the delusion called *avidya* or marigpa perceive them as having, and no map in terms of thoughts can correspond exactly to the territory of the given, for nothing that can be asserted concerning any region of reality or entity whatsoever can exactly correspond to it or exhaust it. Even space and time lack the objective existence we experience them as having. All of this is what the Madhyamikas had in mind when they used the term emptiness or voidness (Skt. *shunyata*; Tib. tongpanyi[b]; Chin. *k'ung*; Jap. *ku*[c]) to refer to the lack of self-existence of entities (Skt. *swabhava shunyata*; Tib. rangzhinggyi tongpanyi[d], which Tsongkhapa preferred to call rangzhingyi madrubpa[e]), giving rise to what Tibetans refer to as the Rangtongpa[f] subschools of Madhyamaka philosophy.[34]

Avidya or marigpa in the second of the three senses the Dzogchen teachings give the term, may be said to be produced by that which I have called "delusory valuation-absolutization" of thought,[35] which the Dzogchen teachings and the Inner Tantras of the Path of Transformation that will be discussed below explain as resulting from an activity of the organism that endows the contents of thought with illusory *value* and illusory *truth* and *importance*, so that what they express appears to be absolutely true, and to constitute the true nature of the given, rather than being an illusory projection of our mind: a vibratory

[a] *rang bzhin*.
[b] *stong pa nyid*.
[c] The Taoist and Ch'an concept of *wu*, which the Japanese render as *mu*, seems to bear some relationship with the Sanskrit *shunya* and the Tibetan tongpa [*stong pa*]). Below its direct relation with the Dzogchen concept of the essence or ngowo (*ngo bo*) aspect of the Base or zhi (*gzhi*) will be shown.
[d] *rang bzhing gyis stong pa nyid*.
[e] *rang bzhin gyis ma grub pa* (this is the term criticized in Gendün Chöphel [2005]).
[f] *rang stong pa*.

activity that seems to emanate from, or to be concentrated in, the center of the chest at the level of the heart, "charges" our thoughts with apparent value, truth and importance, even though in themselves these have neither value nor worthlessness, neither truth nor untruth, neither importance nor unimportance. When this process sustains thoughts of existence, it gives rise to what Buddhist teachings (and with special emphasis those of the Third Promulgation) call overvaluation (Skt. *samaropa* / *adhyaropa*; Tib. drodok[a])—which means that, as we charge these thoughts with illusory truth, value and importance, we give rise to the illusion of self-existence. When this process sustains thoughts of nonexistence, it gives rise to what the Buddhist teachings call undervaluation (Skt. *apavada*; Tib. kurdeb[b] or kurwa debpa[c]).

The inner Tantras, and in particular Dzogchen *Atiyoga*, divide thoughts into three main types: coarse, subtle, and super-subtle. Among the latter, the super-subtle thought structure indicated by the Tibetan expression khorsum[d], literally meaning "three spheres," but which I render as "threefold directional thought structure," is at the core of *duhkha*. In fact, it is the *delusory valuation-absolutization* of this thought structure that gives rise to what I call the "threefold directional apparitional structure," consisting in the delusive appearance of there being a (directionally structured) experience (or action, etc.), an experiencer (or doer, etc.) and something experienced (or acted upon, etc.),[36] and thus involving the illusory cleavage of subject and object, which veils the indivisibility of the continuum that our true condition (is)—as a result of which the subject experiences the lack-of-completeness that is the core of *duhkha*. In fact, once there arises the illusory mental subject that experiences itself as intrinsically separate from the rest of the continuum that the single nature of all entities is, that subject is doomed to experience the lack of the plentitude and completeness that characterizes this continuum.

But on what grounds is it claimed that all subjects and objects result from the illusory sundering of a totality that constitutes a continuum and that comprises both our own awareness and the whole of its contents? Quite a few years ago I wrote a book that discussed the possible philosophical positions regarding the constitution and nature of all that we experience, on the one hand, and of the one who experiences, on the other.[e] Though it is impossible to consider such a complex matter in a few short paragraphs, in the note indicated by the reference mark that appears at the end of this paragraph I quote an excerpt on this subject from an extremely condensed paper I left unfinished.[37]

(3) The *nirvana* that, according to the *Dharmachakrapravartanasutra*,[38] is the Third Truth, can no longer be conceived as the mere cessation of suffering, or as the mere extinction in *nirvana* of the basic human existent with all the problems and difficulties inherent in it. To begin with, in the *Mahayana* the principal motivation for practicing, rather than being the aspiration to free oneself from *duhkha*, is the aspiration to obtain an active, all-encompassing wisdom allowing us to help all sentient beings liberate themselves from *duhkha*—and the Third Truth consists in obtaining this active wisdom, which, *besides* putting an end to the delusion[39] that according to the Mahayana is the Second Truth and

---

[a] *sgro 'dogs*.
[b] *skur 'debs*.
[c] *skur ba 'debs pa*.
[d] *'khor gsum*.
[e] Capriles (1986). I plan to further elaborate and refine the discussion in question in an upcoming work, which I intend to be more sophisticated and precise than the former.

thereby eliminating in the individual the *duhkha* that is the First Truth, allows him or her to help all beings achieve Awakening or at least freedom from suffering.

Besides, in this case what is sought is not the mere annihilation of the sentient being that is the root of suffering, but Total Unsurpassable Awakening (Skt. *anuttara samyak sambodhi*), which is characterized by totality / plenitude and which involves an optimization of human capabilities resulting in consummate activities. (In the third chapter of this book, the non-concealment that the Greek philosopher Heraclitus called *aletheia* will be equated to the dissolution of the delusion Buddhism refers to as *avidya* or marigpa, in the manifestation of *nirvana*—which may be provisional, as it occurs in the Contemplation state of higher bodhisattvas [Skt. *samahita*; Tib. nyamzhak[a]], or definitive, as in the case of Fully Realized Ones.)

(4) There is a Path to be trodden in order to attain the Third Noble Truth, and therefore to surpass the first two Noble Truths. Both the Buddhism of the First Promulgation (the *Hinayana*) and the *Mahayana* explain this truth in terms of the "Noble Eightfold Path," which consists of (1) correct understanding, (2) correct thought, (3) correct speech, (4) right action, (5) right livelihood, (6) correct effort, (7) right mindfulness and (8) right concentration.[40] However, since there is a big difference between the various Buddhist vehicles concerning the manner of treading the Path, I have opted for explaining the Fourth Noble Truth in terms of three Paths and nine Vehicles established in Tibet during the Ancient or Nyingma[b] dissemination of Buddhism.

It must be emphasized that, no matter to what extent the teaching on the Four Noble Truths may be successfully adapted to the views and realizations of so-called higher vehicles,[41] it is a characteristically *Hinayana* teaching, designed to appeal to individuals who understand suffering and all that pertains to the level of the body, and who will react with enthusiasm to the idea of ridding themselves of suffering, yet might fail to understand the "higher" forms of Buddhism and be unmotivated by their teachings. In fact, such individuals may be afraid of voidness as taught in the *Mahayana* and be reluctant to face dangers and hardships in order to help others free themselves from suffering—and, even more so, they may be unable to understand the level of energy that is the essence of the *Vajrayana* and the level of mind that is the essence of Dzogchen Atiyoga (these Buddhist Vehicles will be briefly explained below).

The Tibetan Buddhist Schools and their Schemas of Buddhist Paths and Vehicles

Current Tibetan Buddhist Schools may be classified into:[42]

(1) That of the Nyingmapas[c] or Ancient Ones, which are those who practice the teachings imported into Tibet by Masters Padmasambhava, Vimalamitra, Vairotsana, Shantarakshita and so on,[43] during the "First Diffusion of Buddhism," which took place mainly under the reign of Trisongdetsen (eighth century CE). Though the Nyingmapas originally were not a school, after the arrival of the Sarmapa Schools the Nyingmapas came to be viewed as a school—which, however, had neither hierarch nor hierarchical organization until the Tibetans found themselves in exile and circumstances made it

[a] *mnyam bzhag*.
[b] *rnying ma*.
[c] *rnying ma pa*.

convenient for them to choose a hierarch and organize themselves as a school. It was in the Nyingma or Ancient period that the teachings of Dzogchen Atiyoga were implanted in Tibet.

(2) Those of the Sarmapas[a] or New Ones, which practice the teachings that were imported into Tibet during the "Second Diffusion of Buddhism" that reached its climax with Rinchen Zangpo[b], Ngok Lotsawa[c], Atisha and Marpa Lotsawa[d], and which, in our time, include three main schools: (a) the Kagyüpa[e], (b) the Sakyapa[f] and (c) the Gelugpa[g] (the latter being the Sarmapa school of latest date and the one wielding political power in Tibet for the last several centuries until the Chinese occupation).[44]

(3) That of present-day Bönpos[h], which bears the name of the pre-Buddhist religion of Tibet, but which are officially regarded as the Fifth main Buddhist School of Tibet insofar as they have assimilated the Buddhist teachings of the Nyingmapa in their totality and have adopted the system of monastic organization of the Gelugpas.

The Vehicles are nine in the Nyingma or "Ancient" Tradition and seven in the Sarma or "New" Schools; however, in both cases they are divided into three Paths, which are: (A) Hinayana, (B) Mahayana, and (C) Vajrayana. Though this is the only schema in terms of which the Sarmapas have ever classified their seven vehicles into Paths, in early times the Nyingmapas also employed an alternative arrangement, which classified their nine vehicles into three Paths: (A) Path of renunciation (Tib. pong lam[i]), which consists of the Hinayana and the Mahayana; (B) Path of transformation (Tib. gyur lam[j]), which in the wider acceptation of the term includes the outer Tantras that loosely speaking may be said to conform the Path of purification, and the inner Tantras that constitute the Path of transformation properly speaking; and (C) Path of spontaneous liberation (Tib. dröl lam[k]), which is the *Atiyogatantrayana* (or, which is the same, Dzogchen *qua* Path).

The latter is the schema found in the *Kathang Dennga*[l] by Namkhai Nyingpo[m] (one of the twenty-five direct disciples of Padmasambhava known as the "25 of Chimpu," and one of the "most fortunate eight," each of whom received one of the eight *Mahayoga* sadhanas in Tregugeu), and in the *Samten Migdrön*[n] by Nubchen Sangye Yeshe[o]. Both texts are very early: the first was hidden as a terma[p] or "spiritual treasure" in the eighth or ninth century CE and then was revealed by sixteenth century tertön[q] Örgyen Lingpa[r];[45] the second was buried by desert sands in the abandoned monasteries of Tun-huang since the

---

[a] *gsar ma pa*.
[b] *rin chen bzang po*.
[c] *rngog lo tsa ba*.
[d] *mar pa lo tsa ba*.
[e] *bka' brgyud pa*.
[f] *sa skya pa*.
[g] *dge lugs pa*.
[h] *bon po*.
[i] *spong lam*.
[j] *sgyur lam*.
[k] *grol lam*.
[l] *bka' thang sde lnga*.
[m] *nam mkha'i snying po*.
[n] *bsam gtan mig sgron*.
[o] *gnubs chen sangs rgyas ye shes*.
[p] *gter ma*.
[q] *gter ston*.
[r] *o rgyan gling pa*.

beginning of the second millennium CE and was discovered by the French explorer and scholar Paul Pelliot in the first years of the twentieth century. The fact that Nubchen's text, which could by no means be altered while it lay under the sands of Tun-huang, contains many quotations from Namkhai Nyingpo's book, attests the authenticity of Örgyen Lingpa's terma—and the existence of both books strongly suggests that this way of classifying vehicles was common currency during the "first diffusion of the Dharma in Tibet," and therefore that it came from Oddiyana[46] but was abandoned after the ruling New or Sarmapa schools instituted the classification into Hinayana, Mahayana and Vajrayana. In our time, it has been Chögyäl Namkhai Norbu who has diffused it widely.[a]

A description of these three Paths and the enumeration of the vehicles they contain may be made as follows:

(A) The Path of Renunciation is the "lowest" Path, which in general regards the passions as poisons and the stimuli that activate them as venomous snakes to be strictly and systematically avoided, requiring practitioners to prevent the passions from taking hold of them and dragging them into wayward chain-reactions. Simultaneously, those who follow this Path must progressively develop the mental calm and capacity of introspection that is the condition for the possible unveiling of what the vehicle they are practicing regards as unproduced / unbecome / uncaused (Pali *abhèta*; Skt. *anutpada*, *anutpatti*; Tib. makyepa[b]), unborn (Pali and Skt. *ajata*; Tib. makyepa[c]) and unconditioned / uncompounded / unproduced / unmade / uncontrived (Pali, *asankhata*; Skt., *asamskrita*; Tib., dümaje[d]) and its posterior stabilization, which it views as realization. This Path includes the two vehicles of the Hinayana—(1) the *Shravakayana* and (2) the *Pratyekabuddhayana*—and comprises (3) the Mahayana as well.[47] After the *supposed* debate of Samye between Kamalashila (representative of the gradual Mahayana) and Hwa-shan Mahayana (representative of the sudden Mahayana),[48] the *only* type of Mahayana *all* Tibetan Buddhist schools regard as orthodox is the gradual one. However, the texts by Namkhai Nyingpo and Nubchen Sangye Yeshe, which are not conditioned by ancient Tibetan politics, subdivide the Mahayana into (a) the *Bodhisattvayana*, corresponding to the gradual form of this vehicle, and (b) the sudden Mahayana, which both texts openly declare to be superior to the gradual Mahayana.[49] According to some interpretations, the arrival point of this Path is the realization of voidness (which in the Madhyamaka Rangtongpa schools is understood in the sense of the absence of self-existence of all phenomena: both those that are human beings and those that are not human beings).

(B) The Path of transformation may be divided into Path of purification and Path of transformation properly speaking. In the former, which may be *loosely* said to consist of the three outer Tantric vehicles[50]—which are (4) the *Kriyatantrayana*, (5) the *Ubhayatantrayana*,[51] and (6) the *Yogatantrayana*—we transform our dimension into a "pure" one made of sheer light and inhabited by luminous, immaterial deities, so as to avoid reacting to individuals and situations with passions or defilements that may lead us to produce heavy karmas, and ultimately may realize everything to be primordially pure.[52] In the latter, constituted by the inner Tantras based on transformation properly speaking—which are (7) the *Mahayogatantrayana* (based on the principle of gradual transformation)

---

[a] Cf. Namkhai Norbu (1999, unpublished ms.) and Namkhai Norbu & Clemente (1999).
[b] *ma skyes pa*.
[c] *ma skyes pa*.
[d] *'dus ma byas*.

and (8) the *Anuyogatantrayana* (based on the principle of instantaneous transformation)—we depend on the manifestation of the poison constituted by the passions, which must be used in order to neutralize it, as when snake venom is employed to elaborate antivenin, or as when homeopathy cures a syndrome by prescribing agents inducing a similar one.[53] In fact, it is said that in this vehicle the passions are like firewood and wisdom is like fire: the more firewood we have, the greater the fire we can produce. Likewise, the use of the poison constituted by the passions to achieve the most precious condition that may be wished for (that of Awakening) has been compared to the alchemic transformation of poisons into medicines or into precious metals—which, as the teachings explicitly warn, is always a risky business.[54] The Path of transformation (in the wider sense in which it includes the Path of purification and Path of transformation properly speaking) comprises the whole of the Vajrayana (also referred to as *Tantrayana* or *Guhyamantrayana*), except for Dzogchen *qua* vehicle, which is the *Atiyogatantrayana*. The starting point of this Path is the realization of voidness that is the arrival point of the Path of renunciation, and the arrival point of this Path is the full realization of the Awake awareness that the Dzogchen teachings call rigpa (the concealment of which is indicated by the privative particle “ma” in the term marigpa, which, as we have seen, translates the Sanskrit word *avidya*).

(C) The only vehicle included in the Path of spontaneous liberation is (9) the *Atiyogatantrayana*, which is Dzogchen *qua* Buddhist vehicle (i.e. involving the three indispensable aspects of all Buddhist vehicles, which are the Base, the Path and the Fruit[55]). Despite not being based on the principle of transformation, this vehicle, which involves three series of teachings—the Semde[a], the Longde[b] and the Menngagde[c][56]—is listed among the inner Tantras. Strictly speaking, this Path begins with what it calls Direct Introduction, consisting in an initial, sudden unveiling of the unconditioned, true nature of all entities in the state of Awake awareness that the Dzogchen teachings call rigpa (and which, as shown above, is the point of arrival of the Path of transformation properly speaking). Since the supersubtle thought structure I have called “threefold thought structure” is delusorily valued whenever other thoughts are delusorily valued, giving rise to the subject-object[d] duality and the illusion that the subject and its objects are ultimately important, tension is inherent in the delusory valuation of thought and cannot arise without it. Since in its turn the reGnition of Awake awareness is the manifestation of what the Dzogchen teachings call the “all-liberating single gnosis,”[57] whatever delusorily valued thoughts are present when this reGnition occurs liberate themselves spontaneously that very instant,[58] and since one of the thoughts that free themselves spontaneously is the threefold thought structure, the reGnition of Awake awareness instantaneously puts an end to the subject-object duality and the tensions inherent in it, resulting in an absolute relaxation of body, voice and mind that the teachings compare with the fall of the sticks in a bundle of firewood when the rope tying them breaks.[59] Furthermore, since passions are emotionally charged attitudes of the mental subject toward its objects, whatever passion is manifest at the time the reGnition in question occurs frees itself spontaneously,[60] and the energy that sustained the passion merely adds clarity and intensity to the patency of

---

[a] *sems sde*.
[b] *klong sde*.
[c] *man ngag sde* or *man ngag gyi sde*.
[d] Skt. *grahaka-grahya* (Tib. *’dzin - gzung*), *vishayi-vishaya*/*artha* (Tib. *chos can - yul*/*don*) or *dharmin-jñeya* (Tib. *chos can*/*yul can - shes bya*). (In Sanskrit the normal order of the terms is the inverse of the English: *grahya-grahaka*, *vishaya-vishayi*, etc.)

Primordial Awareness. And so long as this reGnition is manifest, whatever conditioned and made phenomena may arise will spontaneously liberate themselves as they arise and thus will not veil the unconditioned and unmade, which will continue to be fully patent. In the case of those with the proper capacities, this Path and vehicle may result in a far more complete Awakening in shorter time, as will be shown at the end of this chapter. To conclude, it must be noted that the fact that this Path begins with the realization that is the point of arrival of the Path of transformation does not mean that one has to follow each Path to the end in order to approach the next: this Path has the most direct methods for the realization of voidness and the introduction of rigpa, and hence human beings with the right capacity may enter directly the Path of spontaneous liberation by gaining access to the state of rigpa without previously having followed the Path of renunciation until the realization of voidness and then the Path of transformation until the realization of rigpa.

In their turn, the Sarmapa or "new" Schools classify their seven vehicles as follows (a discussion of identities and differences between the vehicles of the Sarmapas and those of the Nyingmapas was included in Capriles [2003]):[a]

(A) The Hinayana, subdivided into (1) *Shravakayana* and (2) *Pratyekabuddhayana*;

(B) The Mahayana, corresponding to (3) *Bodhisattvayana*;

(C) The Vajrayana, subdivided into:

- (a) Lower Tantra, including (4) *Kriyatantrayana*, (5) *Charyatantrayana* (corresponding to the *Ubhayatantrayana* of the Nyingmapas), and (6) *Yogatantrayana*;
- (b) Higher Tantra, corresponding to (7) *Anuttarayogatantrayana* (roughly corresponding to the *Mahayogatantrayana* of the Nyingmapas).[61]

Despite the fact that the teachings of Dzogchen Atiyoga were introduced into Tibet by those who later on came to be known as the Nyingmapas or Ancient Ones, and that they constitute the highest Vehicle of the Ancient tradition, many of the Masters of the Sarmapa or "New" traditions have practiced and continue to practice them, and some of these Masters have ranged among the greatest "Treasure Revealers" or tertöns[b62] and/or among the most accomplished and influential Dzogchen Masters of all times (suffice to mention the Fifth Dalai Lama in the Gelugpa School; the Third Karmapa in the Karma Kagyü School; and Jamyang Khyentse Wangpo in the Sakyapa School).

To conclude, it must be noted that, despite all that was stated above, no vehicle and no Path is absolutely "higher" than any other one. Which vehicle or Path is to be deemed superior will depend on the capacity of a practitioner at any given moment: the Hinayana may be supreme to one individual, Dzogchen Atiyoga to another one—and both one and the other may be supreme to the same individual in different moments, according to what works for him or her at the time.

The Base, Path and Fruit in the Dzogchen *Atiyoga*

In all Buddhist vehicles (*yana*) there is a particular explanation of the Base, the Path and the Fruit. As shown above, in the Ancient or Nyingmapa Tibetan Buddhist tradition, the supreme vehicle is the one that is known as *Atiyogatantrayana* or "Vehicle of the

---

[a] The corrected, definitive edition of Capriles (2003) is the one that will be available in print in the near future.

[b] *gter ston*.

Tantra of Primordial Yoga," and which is often called Dzogchen.[63] This term is composed of dzogpa[a], meaning "complete" or "full" (e.g. when a glass is totally full of water it is said that it is "dzogpa") as well as "perfect" (a perfectly accomplished action is also said to be "dzogpa"), and chenpo[b], which normally means "big" (any object big in size is said to be "chenpo") or "great," but which in this context has an absolute meaning: this is why, following Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche, I render it here as "total." In fact, Rinpoche notes that "big" and "great" are relative terms—something big or great may be bigger or less big, greater or less great—but "total" is an absolute term insofar as it is not possible for something to be a little more or a little less total: either it is total or it is not so).[64] This is why in my book *Buddhism and Dzogchen* I translated the term Dzogchen as *total completeness / plenitude and perfection*;[65] in terms of this translation, we may speak of (i) total completeness / plenitude and perfection *qua* Base, (ii) total completeness / plenitude and perfection *qua* Path, and (iii) total completeness / plenitude and perfection *qua* Fruit.

<u>(I) The Base</u>

The Base (or, which is the same, Dzogchen *qua* Base) is the original condition of total completeness / plenitude and perfection that constitutes the true condition of the individual and of the universe in its totality. The condition in question is total plenitude / completeness insofar as it is a continuum of fullness wherein there are no empty spaces, divisions, dualisms or multiplicity. Though this condition cannot be legitimately viewed as being physical or material,[66] insofar as it is a continuum of fullness wherein there are no empty spaces, divisions, dualism or multiplicity, it may be *illustrated* by Einstein's conception of the universe as a single, continuous energy field, or by those more recent theories that unify all fundamental forces, or that claim that at the dimensional level of Planck's constant there are no continuous, self-existing space and time, etc.[67]

For their purposes, the Dzogchen teachings distinguish three aspects in the undivided Base:

(1) The first one is the essence or ngowo[c], which is voidness. When the Base is compared to a mirror (as in the Semde[d] series of Dzogchen teachings), the essence or ngowo aspect of the Base is illustrated by the mirror's emptiness: since the mirror contains no fixed form, it can reflect and manifest all forms—but then the forms manifested are empty of self-nature, for they are not subsistent, and in order to appear and be what they are they depend both on the mirror's reflective capacity and on the rest of appearances (thus being relative to these appearances and interdependent with them).

(2) The second aspect is the nature or rangzhin[e], which is reflectiveness or "luminosity." In terms of the example of the mirror, this is the aspect of the mirror that causes it never to stop reflecting so long as it continues to be a mirror; though a mirror may equally reflect appearances or the lack of any particular appearance (e.g. when the mirror is in the dark), both appearances and the lack of appearances depend on this reflectiveness and are a function of it.

[a] *rdzogs pa*.
[b] *chen po*.
[c] *ngo bo*.
[d] *sems sde*.
[e] *rang bzhin*.

(3) The third aspect is the energy or thukje[a], which consists in the disposition to manifest the uninterrupted flow of phenomena that appear and disappear in the mirror, and in this flow itself (the literal meaning of the term thukje is "compassion," because Awakening *qua* Fruit is but the continuous patency and unhindered functionality of Awakening *qua* Base, and from the standpoint of Awakening *qua* Fruit appearances manifest as a function of compassion[68]). As we have seen, these appearances are empty of self-nature (Skt. *swabhava shunyata*; Tib. rangzhinggyi tongpanyi[b]), for they are not subsistent and—in terms of the example of the mirror—depend on the mirror's reflectiveness to manifest, and depend both on the mirror and on the whole of other appearances to be what they are.[69]

It is important to keep in mind that, as shown in a note to the translation of Dzogchen as "total completeness / plenitude and perfection," these three aspects of the Base are often subsumed into two: (1) katak[c] or "primordial purity," corresponding to the essence or ngowo aspect of the Base, and (2) lhundrub[d] or "spontaneous perfection," which comprises the nature or rangzhin and the energy or thukje aspects of the Base—and which therefore involves a myriad of perfect, self-accomplished manifestations with a consummate functionality.[70]

The energy or thukje aspect of the Base manifests in three different ways:

(1) The first is the dang[e] form of manifestation of energy, which it is the "stuff of which thoughts are made" and, as such, is not perceivable through the five coarser senses—and, in particular, it is neither visible nor tangible; when the true condition of this form of manifestation of energy is not concealed, it is the *dharmakaya* or "Mind" aspect of Buddhahood, and as such is primordially pure and void of anything other than itself (Skt. *parashunya*; Tib. zhentong[f]). Insofar as it is limpid, transparent and pure like crystal, and insofar as it is limitless like a sphere (spheres have no corners, which represent limits[71]), the teachings exemplify it with a crystal ball. Furthermore, though in itself the dang mode of manifestation of energy does not involve divisions such as inside and outside, the spontaneous arising of the third mode of manifestation of energy (the one called tsel[g]) that gives rise to the illusion of there being an inside and an outside provides the appearance of dimensionality that is the condition of possibility of the arising of the threefold thought structure—the delusory valuation of which, as we have seen, gives rise, in the experience of deluded beings, to the threefold apparitional structure and hence to the illusory subject-object duality, which henceforth conditions the phenomena of dang energy as well, as a result of which there seems to be a thinker-perceiver of thoughts different and separate from the latter. Once tsel energy has manifested, dang energy seems to make up an "inner dimension" (which is what the Dzogchen teachings refer to as the "internal jing[h]"), and again is comparable to a crystal ball because, when we place one such ball in the midst of the "external" dimension, it reflects the whole of its surroundings in its own internal dimension, and just as happens with a crystal ball, the reflections do not appear as brightly

[a] *thugs rje*.
[b] *rang bzhing gyis stong pa nyid*.
[c] *ka dag*.
[d] *lhun grub*.
[e] *gdangs*.
[f] *rzhan stong*.
[g] *rtsal*.
[h] *dbyings*.

or vividly as in a mirror. It is this reflection of dimensional tsel energy in dang energy, together with the inside-outside relationship, that introduces in dang energy the appearance of dimensionality that is the condition for the threefold apparitional structure to manifest and hence for it to condition all human experiences—including those of dang energy, for, as just noted, henceforth also in this form of manifestation of energy there will seem to be a mental subject at a distance from the thoughts that appear to it as object.

(2) The second is the rölpa[a] mode of manifestation of energy, which is self-luminous and utterly beyond the subject-object and inside-outside dichotomies; the paradigmatic manifestation of it is "the stuff of which visions are made" and as such is not tangible or material, yet is self-luminous and is visible with a brightness and intensity of hue that even material phenomena fail to match. When the true condition of this form of manifestation of energy is not concealed, it is the *sambhogakaya*—the "Voice" or "energy" aspect of Buddhahood. The example of it is a mirror, for mirrors reflect perfectly bright and clear images in a perfectly nondual way: *these reflections* are not outside the mirror, and cannot in any way be separated from the mirror's reflective capacity. Moreover, the *sambhogakaya*'s wisdoms of quantity and quality are aptly represented by a mirror insofar as all mirrors can reflect any number of things (it suffices to put it nearer or farther away from the objects reflected), as well as things of any size and having whatever qualities (if we put it far away it may reflect a mountain, the moon, the sun and so on, but it we put it very near it can reflect a mosquito or any other tiny object). Furthermore, once the manifestation of tsel energy (the third mode of manifestation of energy) has given rise to the illusion of duality, and in particular to the illusion of there being an internal and an external dimension, the dynamic inherent in rölpa energy—which, like a mirror, cannot entertain the illusion of a difference or separation between inside and outside, mental subject and object[72]—is the condition for the swift neutralization of the illusion of duality, and as such this mode of manifestation of energy is the condition of possibility of the higher methods of practice in the Dzogchen *Atiyoga*.

(3) The third is the tsel mode of manifestation of energy, which is perceivable through the senses, and appears to the perceiving mind as an objective reality in an external dimension. The *paradigmatic expression* of this energy is *both* visible *and* tangible, for it is the stuff of which material phenomena are made; however, all that appears to exist in the external dimension or jing, independently of what the stuff constituting it appears to be, is a manifestation of tsel energy—and therefore not only solid, liquid and gaseous material phenomena are manifestations of this energy, but also phantoms, hallucinations, and so on, so far as they are perceived as being in an external dimension and constituting an external, objective reality. The simile of this mode of manifestation of energy is a crystal prism through which white light passes, thereby being separated into a spectrum that is projected into an external dimension. When the true condition of this form of manifestation of energy is not concealed, it constitutes the *nirmanakaya* or Body aspect of Buddhahood *qua* Fruit—which occurs when the rölpa and tsel modes of manifestation of energy blend and as a result of this the reality that we call "material" no longer appears to lie in an external dimension or to constitute an objective reality (which takes place, for example, as a result of reaching a certain point in the development of the four visions of Thögel).

It must be noted that if the energy or thukje aspect of the Base were the disposition to manifest phenomena but did not include the phenomena manifested (as asserted by some

[a] *rol pa*.

of the greatest Dzogchen masters of the last few centuries), the latter would *not* be utterly empty manifestations of the energy aspect of the Base: the appearances of the three modes of manifestation of energy (dang, rölpa and tsel) would be essents inherently different and separate from the Base and involving self-being—which would imply that the three modes of manifestation of energy could not be said to be what they are said to be, and that dualism and self-being are the true condition of reality. Therefore, the realization described in the above paragraph would simply be impossible—and in fact there would be no Awakening. (I am not suggesting the great Masters in question are wrong; an interpretation of their reasons is advanced in endnote 68 to this volume.)

Finally, the Base has three ways of functioning in a given human being. However, before proceeding to explain these three, it is necessary to consider in further detail the three senses of the terms *avidya* and marigpa outlined above. (1) The first one, which may be called unawareness of the true condition of the Base, consists in the unawareness of the unthinkable (Skt. *achintya*), nonconceptual (Skt. *nishprapancha*) true condition of the whole of reality due to the contingent arising of a beclouding element of stupefaction (Tib. mongcha[a]) that prevents the reGnizion of the shining forth of the (fivefold) gnosis that otherwise would have made evident the condition in question; this type of *avidya* or marigpa it the first one to manifest in the process that produces *samsara*, and corresponds to the first one to arise—called gyu dagnyi chikpai marigpa[b]—according to the alternative Dzogchen threefold classification of *avidya* favored by Longchen Rabjampa. (2) In our classification, the second type of *avidya* or marigpa is compounded of, (2a) the failure to reGnize the shining forth in question as the expression of the Base and the concomitant error of taking it to be an external reality, which involves the arising of the subject-object duality, and which the alternative threefold classification favored by Longchen Rabjampa—which calls it lhenchik kyepai marigpa[c] or spontaneous illusion—lists as the second type of *avidya* to arise, and (2b), the fully-fledged illusion of selfhood in the individual and of self-existent plurality in the world, which the alternative threefold classification favored by Longchen Rabjampa—in which it is termed kuntu tagpai marigpa[d] or imaginative delusion—lists as the third type of *avidya* to arise; as the term suggests (Longchenpa favored the usage of Third Promulgation terminology in explaining the Dzogchen teachings), imaginative delusion is related to the third truth of Mahamadhyamaka; it involves the singling out of objects (which depends on the existence of a divisive, hermetic focus of awareness) within the continuum that manifested as object when spontaneous illusion occurred, and the perception of what has been singled out in terms of delusorily valued-absolutized thoughts (thus involving the confusion of the digital, fragmentary maps of thought with the analog, holistic territory of the given that such maps are incapable of matching, and the mistaken belief in the perfect correspondence of the one and the other), which gives rise to the illusion of there being a plethora of entities existing inherently, independently and disconnectedly; likewise, it involves the superimposition of the idea of an "I" on the illusory subject that is a pole of dualistic consciousness and the inherent drive to confirm that subject's existence and gratify its acquisitiveness by means

---

[a] *rmongs cha*.

[b] *rgyu bdag nyid gcig pa'i ma rig pa*. Cfr. Longchenpa (1976, p. 24) and the great encompassing work by Cornu (2001, p. 62).

[c] *lhan cig skyes pa'i ma rig pa*. Cfr. Longchenpa (1975a, p. 51; 1976, pp. 24 and 122 note 10 [from *Kandro Yangthik*, part III, p. 117]) and Cornu (2001, p. 62).

[d] *kun tu brtags pa'i ma rig pa*. Cfr. Longchenpa (1976, pp. 24 and 123 note 11) and Cornu (2001, p. 62).

of contacts with the seemingly self-existing, seemingly external entities that are perceived at this stage. Finally, in our favored classification (3) is the seal of delusion that makes it impossible to realize the illusions indicated as (2) to be such and that is the condition of possibility of the maintenance of *avidya* or marigpa in general and therefore of *samsara*; it consists in ignoring (mishepa[a]) that the dualistic appearances that arise by virtue of the second type, are false and baseless, and in normal individuals it always accompanies this second type of *avidya*.

Now the three ways of functioning in a given human being may be considered:

(1) The first one is *nirvana*, which does not involve any of the three senses the term *avidya* or marigpa[b] has in the threefold classification chosen here, but, on the contrary, features the reGnition of nondual Awake awareness' own face, and hence involves the correct apprehension, without any distortion, of the Base's essence, nature and energy, as well as of the three modes of manifestation of energy. Since this condition does not involve the delusory valuation of thought and therefore is free from the subject-object duality, it excludes any sensation of lack—and so it may be characterized as total plenitude. Since it does not involve self-consciousness (for the delusory valuation of thought and the ensuing subject-object duality are the conditions of possibility of self-consciousness), it is free from self-interference and hence the activities carried out in this condition are consummate (like those of the artisan of the *Chuang-tzu*, who drew circles by hand better than with the compass, for his qualities were integrated and thus he suffered no impediment); since it is free from both the ego-delusion and from the Jungian shadow, it is utterly free from evil and is naturally all-benefiting—because of all of which it may be characterized as total perfection.

(2) The second is the neutral base-of-all (Tib. kunzhi lungmaten[c]), which is a condition wherein neither *nirvana* with its free, undeluded Gnitiveness,[73] nor *samsara* with its delusive, dualistic, *duhkha*-begetting mental functions, are active: the term involves the word "neutral" because the base-of-all is like a gearbox in neutral, which does not allow the engine to either drive the car forward (which represents *nirvana*) nor does it move it backwards (which stands for *samsara*). Short-lived, hardly perceivable, subtle manifestations of this condition occur all the time in the mental continuum of human beings (between one thought and the next; between one perception and the next; between one action and the next); its most conspicuous manifestations are specific, prolonged states of *samadhi* which neither belong to *samsara* nor represent instances of *nirvana*—which include the one in which Shakyamuni dwelled for some time until his Awakening (which took place when the nondual awareness [of] the morning star interrupted his *samadhi*). In this condition *avidya* or marigpa in the first of the three senses the term has in the threefold classification chosen here is manifest, and hence there is absolutely no reGnition of nondual Awake awareness' own face;[74] however, the delusory valuation of thought is not active, and hence this condition is free from the subject-object duality, from the illusion of self-existence and so on. Since in this condition time passes and one's precious human birth is spent, yet one neither advances on the Path nor has the capability of helping others, in the Dzogchen teachings dwelling in it is compared with cutting one's own neck. Also in the Mahayana dwelling in this condition is viewed as a deviation: in the *Vimalakirti*

---

[a] *mi shes pa*.
[b] *ma rig pa*.
[c] *kun gzhi lung ma bstan*.

Nirdesha Sutra, all the bodhisattvas present attempted to get a girl out of a *samadhi* of this kind, and in the same canonical source Shariputra was reprimanded for staying quietly in the woods.[a]

(3) The third is *samsara*, which involves the delusory valuation of thought, and hence has as its pivot the illusory subject-object duality that is at the core of *samsara*:[75] this duality is manifest in the realm of sensuality, in which the mental subject reacts to the objects with the three, five, six, twenty-one and up to eighty-four thousand coarser passions; it is manifest in the realm of form, in which these reactions involve rejection, acceptance or indifference, but do not involve coarser passions; and it is manifest in the realm of formlessness, in which the object is a pseudo-totality resulting from surpassing the figure-ground distinction. In fact, *samsara* is a wheel (Tib. khorwa[b]) because it is based on the subject-object duality, and the mental subject, rather than being able to keep a single attitude toward its objects uninterruptedly, is bound to oscillate between upward-propelling acceptance, downward-pushing rejection, and midway-keeping indifference.

Why should acceptance said to be upward-propelling, rejection be categorized as downward pushing, and indifference be qualified as midway keeping? Though the intensity of sensations may be greater or lesser, and their quality may be of one type or another, as the Stoics made it clear, *in themselves* sensations are neither pleasant nor unpleasant. The "strong pain" that we experience when, for example, we have a huge abscess, is but a very intense sensation of a certain quality, which *in itself* is neither pleasant nor unpleasant; however, innate tropisms cause us human beings to reject sensations of this kind and intensity with all our might, and thereby turn them into unbearable pains.[76] In its turn, a pleasant sensation is but of a sensation of a different quality, and *often* of lesser intensity, than the one produced by a huge abscess (though not necessarily of lesser intensity than all sensations that we experience as pain[77])—but which we tend to accept and thereby to experience as pleasure. Finally, insofar as we remain indifferent when facing even lighter sensations, or sensations of a given quality the intensity of which remains below a certain threshold, these become neutral. For example, if a host of beautiful nymphs caressed my naked body with goose's feathers all over, since the type of sensation that results from this action is of the kind we human beings tend to accept, and since I find attractive the individuals who induce it and thus also tend to accept them, as a result of my acceptance I would experience pleasure and so I would ascend in the wheel of *samsara*. However, if the nymphs went on with their activity uninterruptedly for hours and days, at a certain point I would mentally yell, "stop it!"—whereby I would start to reject the experience, and hence I would begin to experience it as a torture and be taken to the bottom of *samsara* just as would have happened if I had experienced a type of sensation of the kind we human beings tend to reject. On the other hand, masochists can enjoy sensations that are generally deemed painful, and the fact that this may have resulted from the association of erotic stimulation and physical punishment in early infancy does not contradict the fact that what allows the masochist to experience those sensations as pleasure is his or her acceptance of them.[78] Likewise, if a neutral sensation persists for too long, at some point I understand it as boring and thus reject it, whereby it becomes unpleasant. It is because we cannot keep the same attitude uninterruptedly, either toward the same object or toward various shifting objects, that we are bound to spin in *samsara*.

---

[a] Luk (1972).
[b] *khor ba*.

In *samsara* the Base's essence, nature and energy seem to be divorced from each other, for the individual fails to realize that the phenomena of energy manifest through the essence and nature aspects of the Base, which he or she fails to apprehend (as we have seen, the essence aspect is emptiness in the three senses this term has in the highest Buddhist teachings: in that in which a mirror is empty of fixed forms, in that in which the *dharmakaya* or the Base as a whole is empty of other substances, and in that of emptiness of self-nature; in its turn, the nature aspect is the luminosity or brightness responsible for reflecting), and that the phenomena in question are neither different nor separate from these other two aspects of the Base; therefore, there is unawareness of the fact that these phenomena are empty of self-nature, and, on the contrary, they are mistakenly experienced as self-existing, substantial, independent, subsistent and so on. This amounts to saying that in the case of ordinary human beings *samsara* involves the three senses the terms *avidya* or marigpa[a] have in the threefold classification chosen here; however, in the case of superior bodhisattvas in the post-Contemplation state (Skt. *prishthalabdha*; Tib. jethob[b]), it involves only by the first two of these three senses of *avidya* or marigpa (for, as we have seen, in this state the superior bodhisattva is aware that his experience is delusory).

(II) The Path

The Path consists in the repeated unveiling of our original condition of total plenitude and perfection and the concomitant spontaneous liberation of the delusive phenomena of *samsara*, which gradually neutralizes or burns out the propensities for these delusive phenomena to manifest—so that in the end it consolidates *nirvana*. Since there can only be unveiling (which, as we have seen, is what Heraclitus called *aletheia*) when there is occultation or veiling (*avidya* or marigpa, which, as we have seen, in the third chapter of this book I equate with what Heraclitus called *lethe*), there is a Path only so long as there are sentient beings in *samsara*.

Also the Path may be the explained in terms of three aspects:

(1) The first is Vision or tawa[c], corresponding to the temporary unveilings of the Base that in this book I have identified with Heraclitus' *aletheia*, and consisting in the nondual reGnition—i.e. the direct realization, beyond the recognition of a collection of characteristics in terms of a concept[79]—(of) the true condition of the Base, or, which is the same, in the manifestation of nondual Awake awareness (Skt. *vidya*; Tib. *rig pa*[80]). Hence in the Dzogchen teachings tawa is the negation of the relevance of positing an intellectual viewpoint as the correct view—which is what other Paths, vehicles and schools call tawa—for the only correct view is the one that goes beyond the intellect and its conceptual interpretations, and that consists in the unconcealment of the Base. (The preposition "of" is within parentheses following a usage that Sartre established: the preposition must be used because our languages require it, but it is placed in parentheses because it implies a duality between reGnizer and reGnizer that is not involved in the occurrence under consideration.)

(2) The second is Contemplation or gompa[d], corresponding to the continuity, during formal sessions of practice, of the unveiling of the Base called Vision or tawa; though

[a] *ma rig pa*.
[b] *rjes thob*.
[c] *lta ba*.
[d] *sgom pa*.

delusion may occur again and again, interrupting this continuity, each time it manifests it liberates itself spontaneously—either naturally without the intervention of mindfulness, or with the help of tricking instructions that short-circuit the dynamic of *samsara*. Therefore, Contemplation or gompa is but the continuity of Vision or tawa in formal sessions of meditation; if this continuity is interrupted again and again by the occurrence of delusion, we may still speak of Contemplation so long as delusion spontaneously liberates itself each and every time it manifests. Hence in the Dzogchen teachings gompa excludes the meditations fabricated and/or applied by the complex of mind and mental events[81]—which are what other Paths, vehicles and schools refer to by the term gompa—for the only genuine Dzogchen "practice" consists in the continuity of the unveiling of the Base and the ensuing *spontaneous* liberation of all that may come to veil the Base.

(3) The third is Conduct or chöpa[a], lying in the continuity of Contemplation or gompa beyond formal meditation sessions, and, when this continuity is interrupted, in using the errors that manifest in one's conduct as an alarm and a mechanism for the spontaneous liberation of delusion. Hence in the Dzogchen teachings the sense of the term gompa excludes keeping a contrived, intentional behavior regulated by precise vows or precepts—which is what other Paths, vehicles and schools call chöpa—for the only authentic conduct and the only one that expresses the true condition, is the one that arises spontaneously in the continuity of the unveiling of the Base.

The Path can also be explained in terms of the Three Phrases in tönpa[82] Garab Dorje's Testament:

(1) "Direct Introduction" refers to the initial manifestation of the Vision or tawa—that is, to the first episode of unveiling of the Base.

(2) " Not to Remain in Doubt" responds to the fact that after Direct Introduction delusion reestablishes itself, and since it is impossible to conceive or remember the state of Total Space-Time-Awareness from the fragmentary state of small space-time-knowledge[83] (for in a limited condition there is not enough room for the unlimited), and since memory cannot reproduce the state that is not conditioned by memory, doubts may arise as to whether one really had the true Vision of Dzogchen, and hence as to whether what unveiled in Direct Introduction is in fact the true nature of all reality. Since so far as one remains in doubt one will not be able to apply the third of the phrases, one will have to go back to the state of Vision / Direct Introduction again and again until, in one's normal, everyday condition, one no longer remains in doubt.[84]

(3) The third phrase is To Continue in the State—that is, to continue in the condition of Vision by means of Contemplation or gompa and Behavior or chöpa.

In short, each time the true condition of the Base unveils while on the Path, the delusive experiences that make up the veil spontaneously liberate themselves and the propensity for delusion to manifest is neutralized to some extent. This repeated unveiling progressively neutralizes the propensities for *samsara* to manifest, with a power that is proportional to the energetic-volume-determining-the-scope-of-awareness (Skt. *kundalini*; Tib. *thig-le*) and the intensity of the delusive experience at the time of the unveiling.[85] In fact, the higher the energetic-volume-determining-the-scope-of-awareness, the more powerful are the imprints made by delusory, samsaric impulses—but also the more powerful is the neutralization of these imprints when the impulses conditioned by them spontaneously liberate themselves.[86] Therefore, if, in individuals with the required

[a] *spyod pa*.

capacity, the process is catalyzed by a very high energetic-volume-determining-the-scope-of-awareness and by the pertinent conditions and practices, it is quite possible to totally neutralize samsaric propensities in a single lifetime.[87]

To conclude, the Path may also be explained in terms of the sequence of realization of the three aspects of the Fruit that will be discussed below, for the first of these to manifest on the genuine Dzogchen Path is the *dharmakaya*; the second one is the *sambhogakaya*, and the third one is the *nirmanakaya*—upon the consolidation of which full Awakening, corresponding to the establishing of the *swabhavikaya* which is the indivisibility of the three kayas, may be said to finally obtain.[88]

(III) The Fruit

Finally, the Fruit is the *swabhavikaya*, which occurs with the fusion of the rölpa and tsel modes of manifestation of energy resulting in the consolidation of the *nirmanakaya* (for this level is attained after the *dharmakaya* and the *sambhogakaya* have obtained, and therefore it involves the simultaneous manifestation of the three kayas), and which involves the uninterrupted patency of the original condition of total plenitude and perfection, resulting from the total neutralization of the propensities for delusion.

In the Buddhist Tantras of the Path of Transformation, we are offered a sequence of realization of the kayas that inverts the one characteristic of Dzogchen *Atiyoga*, the "universal ancestor of all vehicles."[89] This is because, though the names of the kayas are the same, what these names indicate in the two systems differs. In fact, the Dzogchen teachings agree with the other higher Buddhist vehicles in viewing the *dharmakaya* as the correct apprehension of the voidness aspect of the Buddha-nature (which the Dzogchen teachings call the essence aspect of the Base), the *sambhogakaya* as the undistorted apprehension of the "luminosity" aspect of the Buddha-nature (which the Dzogchen teachings call the nature aspect of the Base), and the *nirmanakaya* as the right apprehension of the aspect of the Buddha-nature consisting in the [flow of] phenomena (which is what the Dzogchen teachings call the energy aspect of the Base). However, Dzogchen diverges from all other higher Buddhist vehicles in that it views the *dharmakaya* as the correct apprehension of dang energy, the *sambhogakaya* as the undistorted apprehension of rölpa energy, and the *nirmanakaya* as the correct apprehension of tsel energy. That this makes a radical difference concerning the understanding of the kayas, is evidenced by the fact that, as I have noted elsewhere,[a] the final realization of the Inner Tantras of the Path of Transformation, which these Tantras call *swabhavikaya* and view as the fourth and last *kaya* to be attained, corresponds to what is unconcealed in the Direct Introduction that is the precondition of genuine Dzogchen practice. For example, in the case of the *Upadeshavarga* series of Dzogchen teachings, Direct Introduction is the necessary condition for engaging in the practice of Tekchö[b] that must stabilize the *dharmakaya*—which in its turn is the necessary condition for engaging in the subsequent practice of Thögel[c] that must establish the *sambhogakaya* and finally the *nirmanakaya*. Hence the levels of realization that Dzogchen *Ati* calls *sambhogakaya* and *nirmanakaya* go far beyond

[a] Capriles (2000a, 2003, 2004).
[b] *khregs chod*.
[c] *thod rgal*.

the final level of realization of the inner Tantras of the Path of transformation, and by no means can be attained through the methods of these Tantras.

It must be further noted that, although the Dzogchen teachings posit a Base, a Path and a Fruit, and although they have the most powerful methods for neutralizing the propensities for delusion, which are capable of eradicating them in a single lifetime, unlike the Mahayana these teachings do not posit the Fruit as resting place that is attained at some point, whereupon we become fully Awake Buddhas. In fact, the Dzogchen teachings posit a process of ongoing Awakening which makes the Awake condition ever more firmly consolidated and which ultimately may allow really devout practitioners to go beyond the final realizations of other vehicles and cross thresholds beyond which realizations exclusive to the Dzogchen teachings are attained that result in special modes of death. Thus by applying these teachings it is possible for a really devoted practitioner to attain levels of realization resulting in the dissolution of the physical body after death—or even the one resulting in the dissolution of the body after one's Buddha-activities have been completed, without going through death.[90]

PART I

BEYOND BEING:

A METAPHENOMENOLOGICAL METAONTOLOGY

Kai de kai to palai te kai nun kai aei zetoumenon kai aei aporoumenon, ti to on, touto esti tis he ousia.

"That which has been sought from old and now and in the future and constantly, and that in which enquire founders over and over again, is the problem 'What is being'."

Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Z 1, 1028 b 2 *et seq*.

II

The Meaning of Being:

A Metaontological Hermeneutics of the Most General of Concepts and Phenomena

Although philosophers in both the East and the West have discussed the concept of being, with very few exceptions (among whom Pyrrho and Nietzsche are to be mentioned), Western philosophers associated being with truth. In the twentieth century Heidegger took a leap forward by carrying the discussion of being into the field of phenomenology, and yet this leap was sterile insofar as Heidegger—despite his study of Taoism and Buddhism (in particular Zen)—persisted in the general Western error of identifying being with truth. Though the higher forms of Buddhist philosophy did not fall into this error, they dealt with the concept of being primarily in logical terms—and though the Madhyamika assertion that the concept of being does not apply to *essents*[91] has indisputable phenomenological implications, these implications were not made explicit. In the following pages, I will propose an alternative ontology by explaining in terms of the problems and discoveries of Western philosophy, and particularly those of the phenomenological tradition, the Madhyamika understanding of being. Since this ontology resulted from surpassing the (non-Kantian, non-Husserlian) *phenomenon of being*[92] and thus realizing it to be spurious, it would be more appropriate to refer to it as a meta-ontology.[93]

Since concepts are defined by *genus proximum* and *differentia specifica*,[94] by their very nature they establish a limit in order to exclude something that could not be included in them without causing them to be destroyed (in Nagarjuna's terminology, they must have a counterposition, antithesis or *pratipaksha*), and hence no concept can correspond precisely to the single, true condition of everything and everyone, which does not exclude anything. This is surely the reason why, shortly before the time of Nagarjuna,[95] the Mahayana Buddhist Master Ashvagosha referred to this single, true condition of reality by the term *achintya* or "Unthinkable." The concept of "being" has been said to lack a *genus proximum*, yet it is clear that it has its *differentia specifica* in that of "nonbeing," and hence we are not entitled to use it to refer to this single, true condition.[96]

The above seems to have been crystal clear to Nagarjuna, the Buddhist Master and philosopher who developed the *Madhyamaka* system of philosophy and who is reputed to

have rescued the *Prajñaparamita* sutras from the realm of the *naga*.[97] In fact, he stated in the *Madhyamakavritti*:[a]

> A position *(paksha)* implies a counterposition (*pratipaksha*), and neither of both is true.

This is the reason why Nagarjuna—just like Pyrrho some time before him in Greece[98]—insisted that neither the whole of reality nor any of its parts may be made to fit into any of the four extreme concepts constituted by (1) nonbeing, (2) not-nonbeing, (3) being-and-nonbeing, and (4) neither-being-nor-nonbeing.[99]

So far, our arguments have been circumscribed to the ambit of logic, which rules concepts and their concatenation, excluding that of phenomenological ontology; before proceeding further with our analysis of being, we must establish to what degree and in which way these two ambits are really different from each other. To begin with, we must keep in mind that delusive samsaric experience results from perceiving and experiencing the *given* in terms of concepts that are taken to be absolutely true or false with regard to that to which they are applied.[100] As shown in the preceding chapter and elsewhere,[b] this is produced by what I am calling the "delusory valuation-absolutization of thought," which the teachings of Dzogchen *Atiyoga* and some teachings of the inner Tantras of the Path of transformation explain as the effect of a vibratory function that seems to emanate from, or be concentrated in, the focal point of experience (Skt. *chakra*; Tib. tsakhor[c]) in the center of the body at the level of the heart, which *charges* thoughts with the illusion of *value*, *truth* and *ultimacy*. We have also seen that, according to the teachings of Dzogchen *Ati*, there are three types of thoughts: (a) "coarse," (b) "subtle," and (c) "super-subtle." (a) The ones called "coarse thoughts" correspond to the *mental images* that the Indian Buddhist philosopher Dharmakirti called *samanyalakshana* (Tib. chitsen[d]) or "general collections of characteristics," which are similar to what the Scottish philosopher David Hume called "ideas" (a concept he took from both Locke and Berkeley, but which he modified in order to make it suit his worldview), which are mental phenomena of dang[e] energy that in Hume's view reproduce the impressions of *particular* phenomena of tsel[f] energy;[101] these include both the thoughts used in discursive thinking (Greek, *dianoia*), which are copies of impressions of hearing consisting in the pronunciation of words which, insofar as they are "pronounced" in our minds, are temporal, and the configurations or patterns of sight (often in combination with one or more the other senses), which are copies of impressions received through sight (often in combination with other senses), and which are spatial. (b) The ones called "subtle thoughts" are those involved in intuition (comparable to the intelligible intuition the Greeks called *noein*, except in that contrarily to Plato's belief, and probably Parmenides', it never occurs without the support of either a mental image or *aisthesis* / sensory perception), which Descartes called "intuitive concepts" (but which, contrarily to the view of Descartes, rather than being a source of indubitable truth, if taken to be true give rise to delusion) and which, rather than being sequentially pronounced by

[a] Cf. Guenther (1964).
[b] Cf. the upcoming definitive publication in print of Capriles (2003, 2004). Cf. also Capriles (2000a, 2000b, 2000c). In the past I used the term overvaluation (Capriles [1986, 1990a, 1994a, etc.]).
[c] *rtsa 'khor*.
[d] *spyi mtshan*.
[e] *gdangs*.
[f] *rtsal*.

our imagination, are *instantaneous, mute comprehensions of essence* that, in the *recognition* (in the sense in which authors such as H. H. Price use the term[a]) of sensory collections of characteristics (Skt. *lakshana*; Tib. tsempai[b])—regardless of whether the latter are what Hume called impressions or what he called ideas—interpret and experience them in terms of universals (which, however, are neither absolute truths nor sources of truth; on the contrary, when we take them for the absolute truth of essents, delusion ensues; furthermore, in the same way as what Hume called impressions and what he termed ideas, they are phenomena that exist only insofar as they appear in the human mind, and that even while they appear are empty of self-existence or substance).[102] (c) The paradigmatic expression of those called "super-subtle" is the threefold directional thought structure that, as shown in the preceding chapter, consists in the notion of an experience, something experienced and an experiencer, or of an action, something done and a doer of action. When the vibratory activity at the root of the delusory valuation-absolutization of thought sustains the "discursive thoughts"—which as we have seen are a type of (a) coarse thoughts—that follow each other in reasoning, as well as the subtle thoughts that come into play again and again in the course of the reasoning, we take them to be either the absolute truth, or something absolutely false, with regard to that which the thoughts interpret. When the activity in question sustains (b) the subtle / intuitive thoughts coming into play in sensory perception, we confuse these thoughts with the territory they interpret and take them to be entities-in-themselves. When this activity sustains (c) the *threefold thought-structure*, the result is the manifestation of the *threefold directional apparitional structure*, which comprehends the delusive subject-object duality, condition of possibility of knowledge and action—which by the same token appears to be part of an absolutely true, objective reality, so that we feel we are mental subjects or souls at a distance from an objectively existent "physical universe" (as will be shown below, it was this that led Descartes to take no notice of the fact that the mental subject and its objects were simply projections of delusorily valued thought, and posit them as elements of a *given*, objective, self-existent reality[103]).[104] It must be noted that when it is said that we are being affected by a passion, what has actually happened is that the delusory valuation-absolutization of thought has become more intense, and this has intensified the sensation in the center of the chest associated with the vibratory function at the root of delusion and with the tensions it elicits, by the same token increasing the strength of thoughts and hence their power to lead us unreflectingly into action.

This shows that the logical dimension is not utterly divorced from the phenomenological one: phenomena as we experience them depend on, and are totally determined by, the delusory valuation-absolutization of concepts—and concepts are ruled by logic. Here we are concerned with the *phenomenon of being*,[105] which insofar as it causes us to perceive phenomena as *being*, as *no longer being* because they have been destroyed, as *having never been*, and so on, is the being of all phenomena. Also this phenomenon is the result of the delusory valuation-absolutization of a concept, which in this case is the subtle / intuitive concept of being (which, as will be shown below, has its correlate in discursive thinking). Insofar as this concept is subject to the logic that rules the relations between concepts, the phenomenology of being cannot be separated from logic—and yet the phenomenological is not *the same* as the logical, for whereas the logical, being

[a] Price (1975).
[b] *mtshan dpe*.

timeless, is reversible, the phenomenological is determined by time and as such is irreversible. For example, if an abstract logical negation is negated, the result is the initial absence of negation; contrariwise, as will be seen in a subsequent chapter, if a phenomenological negation is phenomenologically negated, the result is twice as far from the initial absence of negation than the result of the first phenomenological negation (so that, concerning the logic that rules the phenomenological, we could speak of the "temporality of logic").[106]

As noted above, the original Madhyamaka philosophy developed by Nagarjuna and Aryadeva seems to have *implied* a usage of the concept of being that is phenomenological in a special sense, for when they asserted that no forms could be properly understood in terms of the concept of being (or in terms of that of nonbeing, or of that of both-being-and-nonbeing, or of that of neither-being-nor-nonbeing, for that matter), they were *implying* that the phenomenon that arises when we think that something *is* and experience it as *being*, does not correspond to the true condition of the dynamic configuration that is understood in terms of that concept and experienced as *being* (or as *nonbeing*, for that matter). Furthermore, later on, when *Prasangika* Master Chandrakirti insisted that what is to be refuted is not "existence" but what he referred to as "inherent existence" (a difference that much later Je Tsongkhapa emphasized to a far greater extent), what he was asserting was that delusion arose when forms, their qualities and so on, were sustained by what I have called the delusive *phenomenon of being*. This is the reason why I have referred to the phenomenological implications of Madhyamika philosophy and the Dzogchen teachings by the term "metaphenomenological," which will be explained in the following section.

Metaphenomenology and Metaontology

The *etymology* of the term *phenomenology* may be expressed by the phrase "understanding of phenomena"—which, since the word "phenomenon" is derived from the Greek *phainomenon*, meaning "that which appears," may be translated into the phrase "understanding of that which appears." However, this phrase is open to manifold interpretations, and in fact the term *phenomenology* has been understood in many different senses after German philosopher Johann Heinrich Lambert coined it in 1764. Kant, Hegel, Sir William Hamilton, Eduard von Hartmann and C. S. Peirce (the latter in 1902) figure among those who gave the term different meanings before the arising of the German phenomenological movement which, from 1913 to 1930, expressed itself through the *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung*, and which involved mathematician-philosopher Edmund Husserl (the *Jahrbuch*'s editor in chief and the most renowned and influential of first generation phenomenologists in the contemporary sense of the expression), Max Scheler, Adolf Reinach, Alexander Pfänder, Moritz Geiger, Oscar Becker, Hedwig Conrad-Martius and Husserl's best-known disciple, Martin Heidegger, among others.

When, in the preceding section, I contrasted phenomenological negation with logical negation, I was using the term "phenomenology" in an ample sense which includes the meanings given it by Lambert, and specially Hamilton (in whom the term applies to the realm of psychology as different from that of logic) and Stumpf (to whom it refers to a "neutral science"[107] dealing with "psychic phenomena in themselves")—but which, more specifically, applies to the *processes that are the object of* phenomenology *as conceived by Hegel*, according to which the term refers to the "science" showing the succession of the

different forms or phenomena of consciousness (however, as I show in Part III of this book, Hegel's view of this succession as progressive perfecting is inverted, and hence he had to invent an inverted form of phenomenological negation—the *Aufhebung* of sublation—existing only in his own imagination).

However, the meanings of *phenomenology* in relation with which I coined the term *metaphenomenology* involve three of the twentieth century senses of the word having their roots in the German phenomenological movement—namely the ones given it by Husserl, Heidegger and Sartre. Let us begin by stating why I found it necessary to coin the term *metaphenomenology* in contrast with the sense of *phenomenology* in Husserl,[a] which designates mainly the method that this author referred to as phenomenological reduction, which in turn involved successive reductions beginning with the eidetic reduction. This initial reduction "puts existence in brackets" in an instance of what Husserl called the phenomenological *epoche*, setting out to discover what is essential to objects by means of what has been tentatively called "examples" rather than through the analysis of perceptions. Its alleged aim is to make accessible its residues, which are supposed to consist in "pure essences," manifesting as the correlates of intentional consciousness Husserl called *noemas* (i.e. as objects *in* human experience), and being apprehended by means of intuitions (*Anschauung*)—which in this case must be "intuitions of pure essences" (*Wesensschau*). This is why phenomenology is supposed to be about essences rather than about the facts that are the objects of science:[108] phenomenology deals solely with *phenomena*, and *Husserl used the term phenomena exclusively to refer to essences*, or, which is the same, to what he called "ideal realities" or "idealities," as different from the "realities" that may become objects of science. This is not the place to deal in detail with the whole of Husserl's phenomenological reduction; suffice to say that its final stage is the transcendental reduction, which will be dealt with below.

According to Husserl, phenomenology *must not presuppose anything*: not only is it required to abstain from presupposing a natural world independent from and external to human experience, together with the other assumptions of common sense and the propositions of science, as some phenomenalisms also do, but it is supposed not to presuppose even psychic experiences. It is on this basis that it defines itself in contrast with phenomenalisms, and in particular in contrast with Hume's, according to which all physical entities including human beings are simply collections of their observable properties: phenomenology in the sense being considered views this conclusion as deriving from a psychological theory with regard to the origin and meaning of concepts and words, and views it as invalid insofar as phenomenology only accepts knowledge drawn solely from experience, by means of a supposedly presuppositionless inquiry. However, if knowledge, to be phenomenological, has to be drawn solely from experience by means of a presuppositionless inquire, Husserl's system is not phenomenological. To begin with, although Husserl accepted that our understanding of the correlates of intentional consciousness he called noemas, including the essences resulting from the above-considered eidetic reduction, may depend on the horizon of meaning given by the *Lebenswelt*, he viewed noemas as *given*, and defined this term as "being present to the ego without interpretation or distortion due to prejudgment or linguistic usage." Husserl justified this definition of the term *given* by claiming that it was impossible to know whether or not "raw sense data" could appear to human consciousness, and that therefore it

[a] In this discussion, I am limiting myself to the sense of phenomenology in the philosophy of Husserl (1982).

would have been illegitimate to use the term *given* to refer to such data. If what is *given* is not raw sense data but what presents itself to us in intuition, then the intuitive / subtle thoughts that operate in intuition must necessarily be part of the *given*—and therefore if the *given* is obliterated, conditioned / conditioning coarse thoughts of the discursive type, intervening *a posteriori*, must necessarily be responsible for it[109] (like Descartes and most Western philosophers, Husserl overlooked the super-subtle thought structure I am calling the threefold thought structure, and viewed the products of its delusory valuation—experience, and the subject and the object of experience—as *given* elements of an objective reality). The intuitive findings of phenomenology were *given* beyond language, and only later, when the results of investigation were to be described to others, was it necessary to call on language. It was at this stage that presuppositions and prejudices with regard to phenomena could be introduced, the culprit being the languages in which the intuitions were coined—such as those of science and those of earlier philosophers.

In short, Husserl, as Descartes before him, believed it was possible to arrive at a pure intuition beyond presuppositions merely by placing in abeyance all cultural and historical opinions, and indeed all language—which Husserl believed could be achieved by what he called the "theoretical reduction." Husserl was able to perceive the difference between the pure intuition of a *noema* (whether or not the *noema* is a phenomenon in his sense of the term) and the interpretation of this intuition in terms of languages of sciences or of earlier philosophers that *a posteriori* conditioned the previous intuition, because he could compare the former with the latter; however, since at no point did he go beyond experience in terms of intuitive concepts,[110] he could not compare intuition with the truly *given*, which is beyond concepts, and thus realize that intuitions, rather than being *given*, were conditioned by delusorily valued intuitive / subtle thoughts and super-subtle thought structures. Therefore, Husserl's belief that intuitions are *given* is a presupposition, and an utterly wrong one for that matter, for they are phenomena *produced* by the delusory valuation of thought *on the basis* of the sense data which are the only elements of experience that *qua* elements of experience may be said to be *given* (in a sense they are not *given*, for they are supposed to be *produced* by the activity of the brain on the basis of the input of electric impulses from sensory nerves such as the optic nerve and so on, but *among the elements of our experience* they are the *raw material* from which our mental activity produces the phenomena we perceive). Therefore, the essences that phenomenologists are supposed to intuit, insofar as they are not empirical facts, are further removed from the *given* than our everyday perceptions.

The fact that our intuitions are based on subtle presuppositions may be made clear by comparing the intuition of natural phenomena by so-called "primal peoples" with the intuition of these phenomena by members of the modern world: whereas the former experience them as being pervaded and animated by a universal life-force, as being somehow sacred, and hence as being worthy of respect and collaboration, the latter experience them as insentient objects to be used thoughtlessly for utilitarian purposes. In its turn, the fact that the subject-object duality, which underlies each and every one of our intuitions, is based on a super-subtle presupposition is proven by the fact that Awake individuals do not perceive as object what we perceive as object, and that they explain the subject-object duality as a most basic manifestation of human delusion. And the same applies to the appearance of self-existence of the dependently arisen essents given us by our intuitions. Therefore, besides involving presuppositions and therefore being *conditioned* rather than *given*, intuitions convey deceptive appearances.[111] In conclusion,

sentient beings in *samsara* simply cannot go beyond presuppositions and have access to the *given*. (All of this shows that Jacques Derrida, who began his philosophical career by translating Husserl into French, was right in introducing his concept of a metaphysical *clôture* or closure—which will be discussed in Part III of this book—and thus making it clear that phenomenology is but a [crypto]metaphysics[a], and in denouncing the phenomenological emphasis on the immediacy of experience as the new transcendental illusion.)

The above shows the impossibility of apprehending without presuppositions what Husserl called noemas; however, noemas are not the only appearances that philosophers are supposed to investigate. Descartes derived his famous "doubtless truth," *cogito ergo sum* (*je pense, donc je suis*), from the intuition that there was a thinker of discursive thought, and from this intuition he inferred that the existence of the thinker of thought could not be doubted (for the activity of doubting was also supposed to be carried out by the thinker of thought). Kant, in his turn, posited what he called the "I think," which supposedly accompanies all perceptions, as a so-called "transcendental consciousness," foundation of empirical consciousness. Husserl, for his part, posited as the final stage of the phenomenological reduction what he called transcendental reduction, in which consciousness, from the attention to the noematic that is characteristic of the intuition of essences, supposedly turned to itself (i.e. to the noetic) in its intentional purity, discovering pure transcendental consciousness as the ultimate residue of the phenomenological reduction; on the basis of this alleged intuition achieved through reflection, he presupposed the substantial existence of what he referred to by the Kantian term "pure transcendental consciousness," but which corresponds to the Cartesian *cogito* more closely than to what Kant referred to by the term, and went so far as to posit it—like Descartes—as the only truth that cannot be doubted (however, in Husserl the phenomenologically reduced *cogito* has nothing to do with whether or not thinking *implies* the thinker's existence; on the contrary, it involves a suspension of judgment in this regard, for phenomenology examines the *cogito* as a "pure intuition," and as an "act of pure consciousness"). Furthermore, since at this stage the intentional activity Husserl deemed essential seemed to remain without support, our philosopher concluded that it had to be founded in the "transcendental ego," which was the "only being that cannot be doubted," "something" having "a reality of its own," *absolute being* (whereas the spatiotemporal world was *merely phenomenal* being), and the necessary absolute foundation of all phenomenal realities, without which any reality is absurd or self-contradictory. Thus it is clear that Husserl made an illegitimate, mistaken inference from his alleged intuition, for what he supposedly intuited is the mental subject, which is but a *conditioned* appearance *produced* by the delusory valuation of the threefold thought structure, which only exists insofar as it appears, and which, when it dissolves in *nirvana*, is realized to be spurious and baseless—and from the sleeve of this intuition he took out the rabbit of "transcendental ego," which he unjustifiedly posited as a nonphenomenal (and *as such metaphysical*) *absolute being* that is supposed to be the foundation of "merely phenomenal being." Thereby Husserl introduced what in terms of *his own* conception of presupposition was a presupposition, for it was inserted at the stage of the interpretation of intuition in terms of language, and the presupposition inserted was one characteristically concomitant with the language of metaphysics. In fact, the intuition of there being a mental subject does *not* give us a nonphenomenal (i.e. metaphysical)

[a] Derrida (1967).

absolute being that should be the necessary, absolute foundation of all phenomenal realities. What Husserl posited as an absolute truth was the illusion that, as will be shown in the immediately following chapter, Heraclitus denounced in Fr. 2 DK, when he stated that though the *logos* is common, each individual believes he or she has a separate, particular and private intellect. (In chapter IV—the first of Part II of this book—Descartes' and Husserl's errors are further discussed.)

Husserlian phenomenology cannot go beyond presuppositions and attain the *given* because both what it calls *phenomena* and what it refers to as *transcendental consciousness*, are given by intuitions based on the noetic-noematic (i.e. subject-object) duality that, as shown above, is conditioned and constitutes a presupposition. The only way to truly go beyond presuppositions is by attaining *nirvana* and thereby going beyond the delusory valuation of super-subtle thought structures, intuitive / subtle thoughts, and coarse thoughts of the discursive type (independently of whether or not the latter are coined in languages such as those of science or of previous philosophers). Even when *nirvana* is not definitive and therefore still alternates with *samsara*, if its manifestation is clear enough and repeats itself until the individual no longer remains in doubt, as a result of this she or he will obtain the capacity to distinguish the conditioned from the unconditioned, delusion from truth (in the sense of absence of delusion), *samsara* from *nirvana*, and therefore to let others know what is it that must be overcome in order to move from *samsara* to *nirvana*. The systems that make these distinctions without presupposing anything not given either by our samsaric experience or by the manifestation of *nirvana* are the ones I refer to by the label "metaphenomenology," in which the prefix "meta" simultaneously stands for the fact that they are based on going beyond the intuition of *what phenomenology calls phenomena*, and for the fact that they are based on going beyond intuitions and beyond the subject-object duality that is the basis of all intuitions, and thus on going beyond *phenomena in the etymological sense of the word* (in the sense of ridding ourselves of the mechanisms that, on the basis of the "raw material" of sense data, produce baseless appearances that are experienced as objective, self-existent, *given* truths; *not* in the absurd sense of ridding ourselves of sense data).

We have seen that Husserl mistakenly assumed the supposed substantiality of consciousness, maintaining the error of the Cartesian *cogito,* and that he went so far as to posit a "transcendental ego" as *absolute being* and as the nonphenomenal—and as such overly metaphysical—foundation of phenomena, thus breaching the rules of his own method and producing a metaphysics under the guise of a phenomenology. This provides us with the occasion for establishing a further condition philosophical systems must fulfill in order to call themselves "metaPhänomenologies:" they must acknowledge human consciousness and the mental subject to be *phenomena* in the sense of being *mere appearances that exist only insofar as they appear* (which is one of the reasons why below I say that Sartre reached the threshold of metaphenomenology), and that both consciousness and the subject in question are delusive phenomena which conceal the true condition of reality and which must dissolve for the condition in question to be realized. Furthermore, for a system to legitimately bear the label "metaphenomenology," like Derrida's philosophy, it must deconstruct identity; however—as will be shown in Part III of this book—together with identity it must deconstruct difference and *différance*. Despite the fact that the existing Dzogchen teachings arose four and two millennia ago, respectively,[112] and that the Madhyamaka School of philosophy arose two millennia ago, both systems fulfill all of the requisites of metaphenomenology established to far.

What about Heidegger's conception of phenomenology? To begin with, as will be shown in the following chapter, Heidegger, rather than applying the phenomenological reduction as defined by Husserl, gave a radically new meaning to the term, related to what he called the *ontologische Differenz* or "ontological difference." This is connected with the fact that Husserl's method was mainly concerned with the modest task of bringing to light the criteria implicit in the intentional acts we perform in everyday life, whereby we act in, get to know about, and learn to master the everyday world that philosopher called *Lebenswelt* or "world as we live it"—and, where the Moravian philosopher went beyond this, he breached the methodological guidelines he himself set and constructed metaphysical fictions. Heidegger's avowed intent was loftier, for it lay in ascertaining the meaning of being, which in his view had been concealed by ages of dealings with reality and thinking about reality in merely ontic terms (i.e. in terms of envisaging essents and their functionality rather than the being of essents). To this aim, he attempted what has been called a "hermeneutics of human experience" that, by switching from the ontic to the ontological dimension (the one emphasizing the understanding of the being of essents), yet maintaining some kind of *epoche* insofar the inquiry should be limited to what manifests in experience and eschew metaphysical speculation, would bring to light the true meaning of being and, by the same stroke, ascertain the structures of being in human experience.[113] However, in human experience being and its structures appear to be ultimately true, and since Heidegger at no point went beyond *samsara*, he failed to realize the *phenomenon of being* to be one of the two essential aspects of the most basic of delusive phenomena, which is the threefold apparitional structure, and therefore, instead of achieving a genuinely ontological understanding of being and its structures, he came to the utterly wrong view of identifying *being* (the understanding of which was *a priori* in a somehow non-Kantian sense that will not be discussed here) with *truth* and taking for granted the ontological structures of *samsara*.

In Heidegger, the term phenomenology referred to an experience-based ontology that was supposed to eschew metaphysical fictions. In contrast, metaphenomenology must be a *metaontology* that, exclusively on the basis of human experience and of the repeated dissolution in *nirvana* of this experience with the delusive *phenomenon of being* inherent in it—and therefore without incurring in metaphysical speculation—discerns the true character of *being* (i.e. its character as a delusive phenomenon manifesting only insofar as it appears, which in concomitancy with the subject-object duality founds all delusive phenomena of *samsara*). This implies showing how the delusory valuation-absolutization of the concept of being produces *phenomenon of being*, describing the delusive *structure and function of being* that are to be surpassed in *nirvana*, and contrasting the delusive, *duhkha*-ridden structure and function of *samsara* with the undeluded structure and function of *nirvana*. The reason why metaphenomenology must fulfill all these conditions is not that metaphenomenologists are driven by a speculative urge, but that they are aware that, in order to break free from our experiential jail, to begin with we must realize we are in an experiential jail and come to understand the mechanisms whereby we are kept confined to this jail. Concerning the method of metaphenomenology, if we accept Heidegger's concept of a hermeneutics of human experience that must discern the *structures of being* manifesting in this experience, then the metaphenomenological method should be called a "metaontological hermeneutics of human experience" based on the dissolution of the *phenomenon of being* in *nirvana* and discerning all that has been listed in this paragraph.[114]

Above, a new requisite of metaphenomenology was established that, because of the different requirements of time and place, neither the Dzogchen teachings nor the Madhyamaka school of philosophy needed to fulfill: that the *phenomenon of being* be *explicitly* analyzed so as to show it to be a spurious appearance, and that the *structure and function of being* in human experience be ascertained so as to show in the clearest possible terms what is it that has to be undone if we are to break from the jail of *samsara*. In this book I have done my best to produce a thorough metaphenomenology fulfilling this newly established requisite; however, I am not attempting to do so from scratch, but on the basis of the metaphenomenological findings of the Dzogchen teachings and of Madhyamaka philosophy, together with those of my own Dzogchen practice.

For his part, Sartre did not define his conception of phenomenology at length, but limited himself to asserting that the basic difference between phenomenology and science is that, whereas the former deals with essences, the latter is concerned with facts. However, if we define "essences" by contrasting them with "facts," the discovery that science, rather than dealing with facts, deals with perceptions conditioned by the presuppositions of scientists,[a] may confirm the fact that phenomenology, rather than dealing with essences, deals with projections-passing-for-essences. This was shown to be the case with Husserl, and so that it may be seen to be the case with Sartre as well, we must again keep in mind that a requisite of phenomenology is that it should maintain an *epoche* barring it from positing anything not manifesting in experience, and with this in mind consider the following statement by the French existentialist:[b]

> "The phenomenon of being is not being, we have already noted. But *it indicates and demands being*."

The being that, according to Sartre, the *phenomenon of being* indicates and demands, is what he called the "transphenomenal being to which the *phenomenon of being* points."[c115] By definition, something transphenomenal is something that is "on the other side" in relation to phenomena, or that is "beyond phenomena,"[116] and thus the term must be a synonym of *nonphenomenal*. And, in fact, if the *phenomenon of being* indicates *and* demands *being*, then the being it *indicates* and *demands* must be *other than this phenomenon*—yet it could *not* be another phenomenon, for whenever the word being refers to a phenomenon this phenomenon must be the *phenomenon of being*. Therefore, there can be no doubt that the being that according to Sartre the *phenomenon of being indicates* and *demands* is *nonphenomenal* (i.e. *metaphysical*), and hence Sartre's system, insofar as it fails to keep the *epoche* that precludes positing either nonphenomenal realities or a lack of such realities, is not wholly phenomenological.

Despite the fact that metaphenomenological systems must also maintain an *epoche* preventing them from positing either nonphenomenal realities or the lack of such realities, their essential duty is to make it clear that *there is nothing behind the phenomenon of being*—*not* because their creators have the power of leaning out and looking beyond experience, but because in their Gnitive continuum the *phenomenon of being* must have repeatedly dissolved in *nirvana*, and therefore it must have been seen to be a deceptive,

---

[a] Cf. Part III of this book, where a good deal of evidence supporting this view is offered.
[b] Sartre (1980), p. 30. The italics are my own.
[c] Sartre (1980).

baseless appearance. Therefore, in this regard Sartre's system is twice as far from metaphenomenology as it is from phenomenology: not only does it fail to keep the *epoche* that prevents phenomenology from positing anything not manifest in experience, but he outright contradicts the very essence of metaphenomenology by referring to a being that he assumes not to be a baseless, deceptive appearance.

However, as mentioned above, Sartre went beyond earlier Phänomenologies and stood at the threshold of metaphenomenology when he asserted consciousness to be no more than an appearance and to exist only insofar as it appeared—for, as we have seen, metaphenomenology must acknowledge consciousness and the subject-object duality to be deceptive, baseless appearances which exist only insofar as they appear, and which dissolve each and every time *nirvana* occurs. He also came to the threshold in question when he entertained the possibility of the dissolution of both subject and object and their respective modes of being in the attainment of what he referred to as the *holon* (a concept that will be discussed in Part II of this book); however, he failed to cross the threshold in question, for having come short of the dissolution in *nirvana* of subject and object and their respective modes of being, he concluded that the *holon* could *not* be achieved: that it was the unattainable limit to which human existence aspired and all human projects tended.

Besides, Sartre was far more courageous than Heidegger, for the latter avoided the problem of consciousness, which as we have seen had bogged Husserl down, and the concomitant responsibility of determining the *structure and function of being* as it manifests in the subject-object duality that is a foundation of the whole of delusive human experience (as well as how these interact so that the mental subject may *become* the object indicated by the individual's name in the experience of being-for-others and so on), by reducing all that belongs to the human individual to the unitary, vague concept of *Dasein*—whereas the natural task of phenomenology would have been to decompose and analyze all that this concept covers and conceals. Sartre did this masterfully, and metaphenomenology must follow his steps, except in that, as we have seen, it must show being to be nothing but a deceptive appearance circumscribed to human experience, show how the *holon* may be achieved, and so on.

To conclude, since Husserl viewed phenomenology as a method of research rather than as a system to be completed, and since most so-called phenomenologists preceding Sartre failed to develop, by systematic means, "round," all-embracing philosophical systems, it has been contended that abstention from elaborating such systems is a defining trait of phenomenology. In its turn, metaphenomenology must show that it is imperative that we go beyond *samsara*, make clear the mechanisms that constitute and sustain that which is to be surpassed, and lay out the way to be followed if we are to actually overcome it. Since in order to achieve this aim a conceptual frame of reference must have the power of conviction allowing it to neutralize all the mistaken beliefs that keep us circling in the beginningless round of suffering, metaphenomenological philosophies must be, like Sartre's "existential phenomenology," "round," all-embracing philosophical systems. Moreover, since, ultimately, concepts and conceptual systems are neither true nor false—for Truth lies in the state of *vidya* or *aletheia* consisting in freedom from the delusory valuation-absolutization of concepts and thoughts in general, and falsehood lies in the state of *avidya* or *lethe* consisting in conditioning by the delusory valuation-absolutization of thought—such systems, rather than having to be "true," must be narratives serving as both *propaedeutics* and *guides* to the actual practices leading beyond the delusory valuation of thought—and as such be comparable to the headlights' beams on which speleologists

depend while they are exploring a cavern, but which cease to condition them, and even to be visible to them, the moment they come out into the open. As mentioned in the Introduction, insofar as they must be *systems of thought* leading beyond clinging to systems of thought, it would be appropriate to refer to them as "anti-systems."

A Brief History of the Discussion by Western Philosophy of the Concept and Phenomenon of Being

In this section I will briefly review those instances of the consideration of being in the so-called Western philosophical tradition that seem particularly relevant to the purposes of this book. As Heidegger rightly noted,[a] after Aristotle, most Western philosophers took for granted the understanding of the concept of "being," neglecting its analysis. However, there were some noteworthy exceptions to this rule, among whom the ones most relevant for our purposes are Pyrrho, Plotinus, Pascal, Berkeley, Kant, Hegel (whose notion will only be relevant for the discussion of Heidegger's *Kehre* or "turnabout"), Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Heidegger and Sartre.[117]

Pyrrho did not write, but according to Marcel Conche[b] (one of the most renowned specialist on Pyrrho's thought), the Greek Skeptic traced the source of human unhappiness to the concept of being. However, since Buddhas can use the concept of being without being subject to what Shakyamuni called *duhkha* and posited as the First Noble Truth, it would make no sense to identify as the source of human unhappiness the manifestation of the concept of being: one is tempted to think that what Pyrrho viewed as the root of *duhkha* was *the delusory valuation-absolutization* of the concept of being (source of the illusion of self-existence that Madhyamaka philosophy identifies as the *avidya* that is the cause of *duhkha*, and root of the second of the three meanings the term *avidya* has in the threefold classification chosen here).

From a merely logical standpoint, Plotinus—just like the great originator of Madhyamaka philosophy, Nagarjuna—noted that being couldn't be the absolute. In turn, Pascal remarked that being has its *differentia specifica* in nonbeing. Berkeley asserted that *esse est percipi*, which is usually translated as "being is its [own] being perceived," while Kant affirmed that "being is the same as perception" or "being equals perception," and stated that being was the absolute position of a thing and that as such it differed from any sort of predicate (predicates being posited in all cases only relatively to another thing). From a metaphysical standpoint, Schopenhauer stated that being inextinguishably involves contradiction and pain, and insisted on the need to surpass being, achieving extinction in *nirvana*. From his proto-existential standpoint, Nietzsche declared that being was an error that "constituted the last smoke of evaporated reality,"[c] and stated, "Effectively, until now, nothing has had a more naïve power of conviction than the error of being."[d118] In his turn, from a particular phenomenological standpoint, Heidegger attacked the view that being was an empty concept having no content whatsoever, and undertook the analysis of the *phenomenon* indicated by the word being. Lastly, from an allegedly phenomenological standpoint (although, as shown above, he was breaching a basic rule of phenomenology),

---

[a] Heidegger (1996).
[b] Conche (1994), p. 96.
[c] Nietzsche (1997a), VIII, 78.
[d] Nietzsche (1997a), VIII, 80.

Sartre asserted that the being of the phenomenon could not be reduced to the *phenomenon of being*—at least unless we found the "transphenomenal being to which the phenomenon of being points."[a]

On the logical plane, it is imperative to acknowledge, as Nagarjuna and Pascal (and as Pyrrho seemingly did before them), that being has its *differentia specifica* in nonbeing. This is particularly important because, as emphasized by Plotinus, insofar as it is *relative* to nonbeing, being cannot be said to be the metaphysical unity that he called "the absolute"—which, by definition and from a logical standpoint, is that which is *not* relative and which does not exclude anything.[119] (It must be stressed once more that it was for similar reasons that, long before Plotinus, Nagarjuna rejected the idea that being could be the absolute, and that it seems to have been for similar reasons that, even before Nagarjuna, Pyrrho rejected the same idea; however, being far subtler than Plotinus and being free from the pernicious Platonic influence, Pyrrho and Nagarjuna warned that the absolute could not be a metaphysical unity either.)

The view laid out in this book may seem to be Schopenhauerian insofar as it asserts the need to surpass being in *nirvana*. However, Schopenhauer's proposal was confined to the field of metaphysics in that he did not make it clear that what should be surpassed in *nirvana* was a specific phenomenon. In fact, as asserted above, being is not only a concept which as such should be understood from a logical standpoint; the term also refers to a phenomenon, which manifests each and every time we perceive an essent as *being* (or as *no longer being*, as *never having been*, etc.), and very often, as Heidegger noted, when we pronounce, hear, read or mentally repeat the word *being*. It is the phenomenon that so arises which endows particular phenomena with the appearance we call *being* (in the sense of what in the preceding chapter I called "illusion of self-existence" and in one of the senses of what in Kantian terms may be referred to as being *qua* absolute position); therefore, it may be said that the *being of all* [particular] *phenomena* lies in the *phenomenon of being*. As we have seen, also Heidegger failed to realize that the phenomenon in question is a false appearance produced by the delusory valuation-absolutization of a concept that, as Pascal rightly noted, has its *differentia specifica* in nonbeing—and which therefore, as Plotinus remarked, could not constitute the true nature of all essents. Moreover, Heidegger carried this error to an unprecedented extreme, for he committed the atrocity of implying that [the *phenomenon of*] *being* was that which disclosed itself in what Heraclitus called *aletheia* or non-concealment.

Though I tend to believe that the meaning Nietzsche had in mind when he said that being is an error or delusion is not the one I have in mind when I say so, there can be no doubt that the *phenomenon of being* is the most basic and essential phenomenal manifestation of the error or delusion that Heraclitus called *lethe* and that the Buddha Shakyamuni called *avidya* (Tibetan, marigpa[b]), which as noted above, according to the Mahayana Buddhist interpretation of the Buddha's Four Noble Truths and in agreement with Marcel Conche's interpretation of Pyrrho's viewpoint,[120] is the cause of *duhkha* or human unhappiness. In fact, Part I of this book (consisting of the present chapter and the following one) is devoted mainly to clarifying the sense in which this is so—which necessarily involves the refutation of Heidegger's interpretations of Heraclitus' concepts of

---

[a] Sartre (1980).
[b] *ma rig pa*.

lethe and *aletheia*, as well as of the Eastern systems of thought he studied so enthusiastically.

The above must be clearly explained, for otherwise it may seem I am making a salad with the assertions of different Western philosophers with regard to being. The "Second Heidegger"[a][121] insisted that the word "being" is not an empty word, for it has its "appellative force:" it is not a mere sound or written sign that brings nothing to our mind, but, on the contrary, it causes us to immediately conceive something, and what we thus conceive manifests in our experience *as a phenomenon* (as warned in note 2 to this chapter, *neither* in the sense of appearing through the five senses universally acknowledge by Western science and common sense, *nor* in the Kantian sense of being determined by *a priori* forms of sensibility, nor in the Husserlian sense of an essence manifesting as *noema* that is a residue of the eidetic reduction, but in the sense of being an appearance in human experience rather than a metaphysical essence, substance or hypostasis). Despite the fact that all adult humans automatically recognize the phenomenon that so manifests as the most basic, clear and comprehensible of appearances, it is difficult or impossible for us to define it, for, insofar as it corresponds to the most general of concepts,[122] it cannot be described by *genus proximum*.[123] As we have seen, Pascal expressed its *differentia specifica* when he noted that the concept of being is defined only in contrast with nonbeing; however, the great Jansenist was unable to explain either the concept of being or that of nonbeing, for it is impossible to explain the most general and basic of dualities in terms of more particular dualities. Moreover, as will be shown below, the difference between being and nonbeing is far subtler than it may seem to be.

The Phenomenon of Being

With regard to the nature of being (and its relationship to nonbeing), it may be worthwhile to consider the following words by Heidegger:[b]

> …"Away from this empty word 'being'; go to the particular essents," proves to be not only a hasty but also a highly questionable counsel. Let us once more think the whole matter through with the help of an example that, to be sure, like every example that we cite in dealing with this question, can never clarify the whole matter in its full scope and therefore must be taken with certain reservations.
>
> By way of an example, we substitute for the universal concept "being" the universal concept "tree." If we wish now to say and define what the essence of tree is, we turn away from the universal concept to the particular species of tree and the particular specimens of these species. This method is so self-evident that we almost hesitate to mention it. Yet the matter is not as simple as all that. How are we going to find our famous particulars, the individual trees *as such*, *as* trees; how shall we be able even to *look for* trees, unless the representation of what a tree in general is shines before us? If this universal representation "tree" were so utterly indeterminate and blurred as to give us no certain indication for seeking and finding, we might perfectly well turn up automobiles or rabbits as our determinate particulars, as examples for tree. Even though it may be true that in order to determine the essence "tree" in every respect, we must pass through the particular, it remains at least equally true that the elucidation of essence and richness of essence is contingent on the radicalness with which we represent and know the universal essence

[a] Heidegger (1987).

[b] Heidegger (1987), pp. 79-82. Niemayer's translation had "being" instead of "essent."

"tree," which in this case means the essence "plant," which in turn means the essence "living things" and "life." Unless we are guided by a developed knowledge of tree-ness, which is manifestly determined from out of itself and its essential ground, we can look over thousands and thousands of trees in vain—we shall not see the tree for the trees.

Now, precisely with regard to "being," one might reply that since it is the most universal of concepts our representation cannot rise from it to anything higher. In dealing with this supreme and most universal concept reference to what is subsumed "under" it not only is advisable but is the only hope of overcoming [the illusion of] its emptiness.

Striking as this argument may seem, it is false. Here let us give two reasons:

1. It is in general open to question whether the universality of being is a universality of genus. Aristotle already suspected this.[124] Consequently it remains questionable whether an individual essent can ever be regarded as an example of being, in the same way that oak is an example of "tree as such." It is doubtful whether the modes of being (being as nature, being as history) represent "species" in the "genus" being.

2. The word "being" is indeed a universal name and seemingly a word among others. But this appearance is deceptive. The name and what it names are unique. For this reason any illustration by examples is a distortion: in this case every example proves not too much but too little. We have pointed out above that we must know in advance what "tree" means in order to be able to seek and find the particulars: the tree species and the individual trees. This is still truer of being. Supreme and incomparable is the necessity that we understand the word "being" beforehand. Hence it does not follow from the "universality" of "being" in relation to all essents that we must hasten to turn away from it, toward the particular; no, what follows is just the opposite, that we should persevere with being and raise the uniqueness of this name and what it names to the level of knowledge.

Over against the fact that the meaning of the word "being" remains an indeterminate vapor for us, the fact that we understand being and differentiate it with certainty from nonbeing is not just another, second fact; rather, the two belong together, they are one. Meanwhile this one has altogether lost the character of a fact for us. We do not find it *also* given among many other facts. Instead we begin to suspect that some process is at work in what we have hitherto regarded as a mere fact. And the nature of this process excepts it from other "occurrences."

So that that the fact that the word "being" refers to a specific phenomenon, and the fact that upon hearing or reading this word the corresponding phenomenon manifests in our experience, may be clearly understood, let us consider the following words by Heidegger:[a]

The being which belongs to every essent[b] whatsoever, and which is thus dispersed among all that is most current and familiar, is more unique than all else.

Everything else, each and every essent, even if it is unique, can be compared with other things. Its determinability is increased by these possibilities of comparison. By virtue of them it is in many respects indeterminate. Being, however, can be compared with nothing else. Over against being, the only other is nothing.[125] And here there is no comparison. If being thus represents what is most unique and determinate, the word "being" cannot be empty. And in truth it never is empty. We may easily convince ourselves of this by a comparison. When we perceive the word "being," either hearing it as a phonetic unit or seeing it as a written sign, it immediately gives itself as something other than the succession of sounds and letters "abracadabra." This too is a succession of sounds, but we say at once that it is meaningless, though it may have its meaning as a magic formula. But

---

[a] Heidegger (1987), pp. 79 and 82.

[b] *Alles Seiende*: *touts les étants*: all essents (or, which is the same, all that "is [in the process of] being").

"being" is not meaningless in this way. Similarly "being," written and seen, is at once different from "kzomil." This too is a sequence of letters but in connection with this sequence we cannot think anything. There is no such thing as an empty word; at most a word is worn out, though still filled with meaning. The name "being" retains its appellative force…[126]

Let us suppose that this indeterminate meaning of being does not exist and that we also do not understand what this meaning means. What then? Would there merely be a noun and a verb less in our language? No. *There would be no language at all*.[127] No essent *as such* would disclose itself in words; it would no longer be possible to invoke it and speak about it in words. For to speak of an essent as such includes: to understand it in advance as an essent, that is, to understand its being. Assuming that we did not understand being at all, assuming that the word "being" did not even have its vaporous meaning, there would not be a single word. We ourselves could never be *speakers*. Altogether we could not be as we are. For to be a man is to speak. Man says yes and no only because in his profound essence he is a speaker, *the* speaker. That is his distinction and at the same time his burden. It distinguishes him from stones, plants, animals, but also from the gods. Even if we had a thousand eyes and a thousand ears, a thousand hands and many other senses and organs, if our essence did not include the power of language, all essents would be closed to us, the essent that we ourselves are, no less than the essent that we are not.

That which Buddhists call Awakening implies the disappearance of the spurious *phenomenon of being* and the unveiling of the absolute condition, which having no limits is not relative to anything, and thus cannot fit within the limits of any concept and cannot be expressed in words. Even though Heidegger faced the *phenomenon of being* and took it as a privileged object of his ontology, since he never had a glimpse of *nirvana*, he failed to realize what is most essential and important regarding the phenomenon in question: that it constitutes the most basic manifestation of the error or delusion that Heraclitus called *lethe* or "veiling" and that Shakyamuni named *avidya*. On the contrary, as it has already been noted, and as will be shown in greater detail below, he wrongly believed that being was that which showed itself in Heraclitus' *aletheia* or "non-concealment."

We have seen repeatedly that the *given* cannot be properly understood in terms of any concept. However, though *in themselves* concepts have no value, truth or importance whatsoever, the delusory valuation-absolutization of thought having as its core the vibratory activity that seems to be concentrated in, or to emanate from, the center of the chest at the level of the heart, "charges" the contents of thoughts with an illusion of value, truth and importance, and so they seem to be absolutely true (or false), etc. The most general of concepts is the concept of being, which is inherent in the super-subtle thought structure that here I am referring to as the threefold thought structure; therefore, when this structure is delusorily valued-absolutized, the subject of experience, the object of experience, and experience itself, come to be sustained by the most basic and essential of delusive phenomena, which is the one I call the *phenomenon of being*. As a result of this, the subject of experience, the object of experience, and experience itself appear to have what Madhyamika philosophy refers to by the Sanskrit term *swabhava* and the Tibetan term rangzhin[a]), which as seen in the preceding chapter is the very basis of the delusion at the root of *samsara* (*avidya* or marigpa[b] in the second and third of the senses the terms have in the threefold classification chosen here): we obtain the illusion that, inherently and

[a] *rang bzhin*.
[b] *ma rig pa*.

absolutely, essents *are*—or that, inherently and absolutely, they *are no longer*, because they have been destroyed, or *never have been*, etc. It is clear that the concept of being is also expressed by a coarse, discursive thought, for we may pronounce either with our mouths or in our mind the word "being" and / or the corresponding verbal forms. However, when we think these coarse, discursive thoughts in an assertive sentence (such as "A *is*"), they bring to our mind the *phenomenon of being* that results from the delusory valuation-absolutization of the concept of being inherent in the threefold thought structure, which at this point has come to sustain the grammatical subject ("A")—and this is indissolubly mixed with the certitude that the grammatical subject also has being in the sense of actuality (which will be considered below), because, as we have just seen, we can think of the grammatical subject as being no longer, as never having come into being, and so on, but in this case the verb is telling us that the grammatical subject *has being at this moment*. (In the preceding chapter I rendered the Sanskrit term *swabhava* and the Tibetan term rangzhin as "self-existence;" however, in this and the following chapters, following Heidegger, Sartre and other European phenomenologists, I will reserve the term "existence" for human essents, and so in the case of the essents that appear as object I will refer to the illusion of *swabhava* or rangzhin by the term "illusion of self-being." As will be shown below, it is this experience of essents as *being*—rather than as *not being*—in which the illusion of self-being is mixed with being *qua* actuality, which Kant referred to by the term "absolute position.")

When, besides delusorily valuing the concept of being inherent in the super-subtle threefold thought structure (whether it remains implicit or is made explicit in language), we delusorily value the subtle / intuitive concept determining the identity of a particular essent, we experience this essent as *being*, inherently and absolutely, an entity of the type corresponding to the concept in question. In turn, when we delusorily value the ideas in terms of which qualities are understood, we experience them as qualities of entities having their own self-being, etc. Therefore, also the copulative use of the verb "to be" (as in *A* is *B*) elicits, and responds to, the most basic manifestation of the error or delusion that Heraclitus called *lethe* and that Shakyamuni called *avidya*. (As will be shown below, the experience of essents as *being this or that* is what Kant referred to by the term "position" when used without the qualifier "absolute;" however, as just noted, the illusion of absoluteness is also involved in this experience.)

To summarize all that has been explained so far, the *phenomenon of being*—the most basic manifestation of the error or delusion under consideration—gives us the being of essents and serves as the basis both for the delusive appearance of essents as involving self-being—which is what Chandrakirti and Tsongkhapa referred to as the delusive appearance of inherent existence[128]—and for the perception of being *qua* actuality (both of which are indissolubly mixed in the experience of sentient beings and both of which are manifestations of the basic human delusion Buddhism calls *avidya*, in the sense it has for the Madhyamaka school of philosophy).

Being and Perception,
Being *qua* Actuality and Being *qua* Self-Being,
And the Being of the Subject-Object Duality

Now we can ponder on the relation between *being* and perception. We have seen that Bishop Berkeley stated that *esse est percipi*, and that this is usually translated as "being

is its being perceived." Though Berkeley understood this statement as implying that the human subject brought the available essent (i.e. the entity in the world appearing as object) into being from his or her own being, it is well-known that Kant never implied anything of the kind (he explicitly refuted Berkeley's view, which he called dogmatic idealism, and even that of Descartes, which he called problematic idealism[a]), and yet he used a way of speaking very similar to Berkeley's when he asserted that "being is the same as perception" or that "being equals perception." Heidegger showed Kant's assertion to be unclear, for it failed to specify whether the term "perception" was being understood in the sense of perceiving, in the sense of the [available essent[129] being] perceived, or in the sense of being perceived.[b] The second possibility was to be discarded, for perception is certainly not the available essent, but that which perceives the available essent and relates itself to what is perceived[c] (furthermore, it would be absurd to reduce the being of the available essent [being] perceived to the available essent [being] perceived, for this would amount to identifying the essent with its own being, and hence would do away with the necessary difference between essents and their being). The first possibility is even less plausible, for it would be even more absurd to equate perception *qua* perceiving with what Kant called existence but which, insofar as we are reserving the use of this term for the human essent and insofar as what Kant had in mind involved a perception of absoluteness, I will call "*the seeming self-being of an available essent*." Heidegger tells us that perhaps what I am calling "the being of the available essent" could be equated with the *being-perceived* of the available essent being perceived (i.e. with this available essent's *perceivedness* [*Wahrgenommenheit*][d]) and concluded that what Kant had in mind was the uncoveredness (*Entdeckheit*) in perception of the available essent.[e] This conception seems to be Heidegger's own understanding of *aletheia*; however, no matter whether or not the concept being expressed is actually Kant's, the assertion would be empty unless we were made to understand *how*—or rather *as what*—was the available essent to be uncovered.

The first section of Kant's *Beweisgrund*[f] divides into four disquisitions, the first of which is "On existence in general," which discusses three theses: (1) Existence (which is understood in the sense of being in general, and in particular of the being of available essents) is not a predicate or determination of any thing at all; (2) Existence (i.e. being) is the absolute position of a thing and therefore differs from any sort of predicate, which, as such, is posited at each time merely relatively to another thing; (3) Can I really say that there is more in existence (i.e. in being) than in mere possibility?

It is best to begin considering the second thesis with regard to the assertive usage of the verb—i.e. its usage when I say "A *is*"—insofar as this automatically elicits the pure *phenomenon of being* (rather than the manifestation of this primary phenomenon in the secondary guise of an essent *being this or that*—i.e. as when I say "A *is B*"), and insofar as the manifestation of the pure *phenomenon of being* provides the best opportunity for us to realize *how*—or rather *as what*—is the available essent to be unveiled: what manifests is

---

[a] Kant (1996). (In the 1781 Ed. pp. 226-235; in the 1787 Ed. pp. 274-294; cf. the German Eds. of 1956 and 1966.)
[b] Heidegger (1988), § 8 b, pp. 47-8 (original German Ed. pp. 64-7).
[c] Heidegger (1988), § 8, p. 47 (original German Ed. p. 64).
[d] Heidegger (1988), § 8, p. 48 (original German Ed. p. 65).
[e] Heidegger (1988), § 9, p. 48 (original German Ed. p. 65).
[f] Kant (1922), vol. 2, p. 76. For a discussion of these theses, cf. Heidegger (1988), § 7, p. 32 (p. 43 of the original German Ed.).

what Kant called "absolute position," and which he regarded as the being of available essents that shows itself as perception. However, we *also* conceive the available essent as being *actual*—and indeed, as we will see below, Kant confused "absolute position" with *actuality* (*Wirlichkeit*), and Heidegger failed to realize this confusion as such.

However, does "position" mean positing (*Setzen*) *qua* an action of the subject, or does it mean the posited (*gesetzte*) object—or even the positedness (*Gesetzheit*) of the posited object?[a] Common sense tells us we can perceive an available essent only if it *is* and because it *is* already before we perceive it, and in fact, whenever we perceive it, it reveals itself as an essent that *is* already before we perceive it[b] and which simply *reveals itself to us* in perception. Furthermore, "A *is*" implies that the essent that *reveals itself to us* in perception is taken in its own self—not with regard to any relation to another and not with regard to relations subsisting within its essential content, but as the essent in itself, "not relatively but absolutely in its own self."[c] According to Heidegger, the term "position" in Kant's statement is to be interpreted just as he interpreted Kant's use of "perception." He writes:[d]

> "[Being is] not the positing and not the posited and also not positedness; instead, being is that which is already understood in positing *as the letting-stand of something on its own self*; it is what is already understood in positing as a specific intentional comportment according to its directional sense: *the thing's being-stood-upon-its-own-self with all its predicates*, the self-determined presence of a thing."

Therefore, the term "absolute position" as used by Kant corresponded to the Madhyamika understanding of the Sanskrit term *swabhava*: it corresponds to an entity's being sustained by what I have been calling the *phenomenon of being*, or, which is the same, to the *delusion of self-being* that, as I have noted, results from the delusory valuation-absolutization of the concept of being and of the concept of the entity (which, as we have seen, both Chandrakirti and Tsongkhapa called "inherent existence" and regarded as the essential delusive appearance of *samsara*, which was to be surpassed by those aspiring to *nirvana*). Heidegger writes:[e]

> …We must… be able to make clear to ourselves what Kant's interpretation of actuality as absolute position really means. Obviously, absolute positing does not mean for Kant that the subject posits the actual from within itself [putting it] outside itself in the sense that it freely and arbitrarily first deposits something of the kind there and [then] subjectively assumes [that] something to be actual [—i.e. that then] for some reason or other [it] judges that [that] something is actual. Rather, *absolute positing* understood properly—even if Kant does not interpret it explicitly [in this way]—means positing *qua… letting something stand of its own self* and *indeed absolutely*, as detached, set free as "*an und vor sich selbst*" (*in and for its own self*), as Kant says.

[a] Heidegger (1988), § 8, p. 48 (original German Ed. p. 66).
[b] Heidegger (1988), § 8, p. 49 (original German Ed. p. 66).
[c] Heidegger (1988), § 21, p. 316 (original German Ed. p. 450).
[d] Heidegger (1988), § 21, pp. 316-7 (original German Ed. p. 450). Italics my own.
[e] Heidegger (1988), § 12, p. 117 (original German Ed. p. 166). In the words *indeed absolutely*, and *in and for its own self*, the italics are my own.

The essence of Madhyamika philosophy is the understanding that the essents of the "physical world" lack self-being (in the language of the *Prasangika* Master Chandrakirti adopted by Tsongkhapa, they do not exist *inherently*, *in their own right*), and yet they *produce effects*: they are *actual* (German: *wirlich*). The Sanskrit term *bhava* and the Tibetan ngöpo[a] (translated as "thing," "existence," "becoming" and so on, according to the context) could always be understood (1) as referring to an essent's capacity to produce effects that may be commonly perceived, which is what Madhyamikas understood as *actuality* and indicated by the Sanskrit term *arthakriyashakti* and the Tibetan term dönje nüpa,[b] and which was not to be negated, or (2) as meaning substantiality and "self-being," which is the meaning of the Sanskrit term *swabhava* and the Tibetan noun rangzhin[c], and which was to be negated, for all phenomena were empty of it. In his works, the *Prasangika* Master Chandrakirti, upon declaring all phenomena empty of the being Madhyamaka negated—substantial self-being or *swabhava*—referred to the latter several times as "inherent" or "true" existence (which, when translated to the terminology used in the present part of this book, means *inherent or true being*).[130]

According to general Madhyamaka, (1) all that is *actual* or *effective* (Skt. *arthakriyashakti*; Tib. dönje nüpa) must share four characteristics, which are thus listed in a short book by Thinle Norbu Rinpoche:[d131]

> "Collectively perceived" (Tib. thunpar nangwa[e]). For example, water, fire, sun and moon are perceived similarly by [all human beings];
> "Capable of [producing] effects [or capable of] functioning" (Tib. dönje nüpa[f]). For example, the earth can support all human beings;
> "Produced by root cause and condition (Tib. gyukyen gyi kyepa[g]). For example, when a seed, which is the root cause, and [earth,] water, warmth, [light] and air, which are the contributory circumstances, come together, a plant grows; and
> "Nonexistent when examined (Tib. tag na denpa[h]).

As the Madhyamaka school understands the terms, an example of being *qua* actuality or effectiveness (German: *Wirlichkeit*) is the presence in the world of the "dynamic corporeal configuration" we call "a pot," and the actuality and functionality of this "dynamic corporeal configuration" *qua* a collectively perceived essent which is collectively regarded as being actual and which produces collectively-perceived effects. However, this pot is "nonexistent when examined," which is to say that our apprehension of the same "dynamic corporeal configuration" as having a self-nature or self-being (Skt. *swabhava*; Tib. rangzhin) and as in itself being a pot and so on is a delusion: this is what I am calling the delusion of self-being,[132] corresponding to perceiving essents in terms of the delusory valued concept of being (i.e. in terms of what I have been calling the *phenomenon of being*) and in terms of other delusorily valued concepts.

---

[a] *dngos po*; Skt. *vastu*.
[b] *don byed nus pa*.
[c] *rang bzhin*.
[d] Thinley Norbu (1985), p. 40 (1st. ed. p. 25).
[e] *mthun par snang ba*.
[f] *don byed nus pa*.
[g] *rgyu rkyen gyis skyes pa*.
[h] *brtag na dben pa*.

Just as the formula *esse est percipi* as understood by Bishop Berkeley does not make sense, the essentially different, yet similarly sounding Kantian thesis equating being *qua* actuality or effectiveness with perception does not make sense: both in the case of a hallucinated stone and in that of what common sense calls “an actual stone,” we *perceive the stone*, and, furthermore, we perceive it as being actual or effective; since the hallucinated stone cannot break the head of the person at which it is thrown, but the “actual” stone can break it if it hits its target, there are no grounds whatsoever for equating perception with being *qua* actuality or effectiveness; contrariwise, there are grounds for establishing the hallucinated stone to be ineffectual, and the “actual” stone to be actual or effective. Perception may be relevant as a criterion of actuality or effectiveness only in the sense in which it is relevant in the above-quoted Madhyamika understanding of it: if the perception of all human beings deemed to have a sound sense agrees that something is effective or actual (i.e. that it is not a hallucination of other type of illusion), it must be deemed to be effective or actual.

Madhyamika philosophy distinguished what it called “relative truth” (Skt. *samvritisatya*; Tib. kundzob denpa[a]), consisting in all that the world (i.e. the mass of deluded beings in *samsara*) holds to be true, from what it referred to as “absolute truth” (Skt. *paramarthasatya*; Tib. döndam denpa[b]), which is what Awakening (or, prior to it, the discovery of the true condition of reality in the third bodhisattva path) shows to be actually true and which, from the standpoint of the world, contradicts what the world holds to be true. This philosophical system made the point that the illusion of self-being is not true even *qua* relative truth or conventional truth (Skt. *vyavaharasatya*; Tib. thanyekyi denpa[c]) and that, conversely, effectiveness / actuality is true *qua* relative truth; however, insofar as relative truth is what is true for the mass of deluded beings in *samsara*, this must *not* be understood to mean that the illusion of self-being is a manifestation of delusion, but that effectiveness / actuality, insofar as it is relatively true, is not a manifestation of delusion. This point was opportunely made around the middle of the twentieth century by the Gelugpa monk and scholar Gendün Chöphel, who reminded us that the very etymology of the Sanskrit term that is translated as “relative truth” makes the point that what is so called is delusion rather than truth, for it means “obscuration to correctness” or “thoroughly confused:”[d]

> ‘Relative’ is the word ancient scholars used for translating the Sanskrit *samvriti*, which means ‘obscuration to correctness’ or ‘thoroughly confused’. Because one is ‘deluded about the meaning’, we must also understand ‘relative truth’ as ‘deluded [pseudo-]truth’.

Thus both the experience of being *qua* actuality and experience in terms of the *phenomenon of being*—or, which is the same, in terms of the delusion of *self-being*—are manifestations of delusion. In fact, although the theoretical distinction between them was make for good, valid reasons, in human experience they are not separate, distinguishable phenomena, for it is only possible to perceive being *qua* actuality so long as human perception is sustained by the *phenomenon of being* or delusion of *self-being*, and therefore the perception of being *qua* actuality is in all cases a perception involving the illusion of

[a] *kun rdzob bden pa*.
[b] *don dam bden pa*.
[c] *tha snyad kyi bden pa*.
[d] Gendün Chöphel (2005).

self-being—and, in fact, the moment the illusion of self-being dissolves in the realization of absolute truth, being *qua* actuality and relative truth instantly dissolve (which does *not* mean that the configuration we call *table* disappears when absolute truth manifests: what it means is that we no longer perceive it as being *in itself* a table, even though we are certainly able to identify it as such and refer to it by the word "table").[133] In fact, the only way we may distinguish being *qua* actuality from the illusion of *self-being* is by mentally decomposing our perceptions, just as we do when we distinguish the redness of a tomato from its tomato shape. (Fully Awake Buddhas can determine being *qua* actuality and speak of it even though they no longer have the experience of the *phenomenon of being* or, which is the same, of the illusion of *self-being*. However, as I have shown elsewhere[a] and as will be seen in a note to a chapter of Part III of this book, Buddhas have no perception of being *qua* actuality, and so if they speak of it they do so without "own-mind:" their assertions are not of the type that has been called self-directed or interior-directed,[b] but of the kind that in not so precise terms has been referred to as "other-directed" or "exterior-directed."[c] [134])

Despite the fact that the *perception* of *actuality* and the perception in terms of the *phenomenon of being* corresponding to the delusion of *self-existence* are in all cases mixed and cannot be separated from each other, below it will be shown that the theoretical distinction between them, which Je Tsongkhapa regarded as the crucial point of Madhyamaka, may be helpful in contrasting the Madhyamika and Dzogchen views with those prevailing in mainstream Western philosophy, and in particular in what regards the conceptions of being, existence, truth, actuality and so on. To begin with, we are entitled to make the theoretical distinction between being *qua* actuality and the illusion of *self-being* because of the following difference: *in itself* the *phenomenon of being* or delusion of *self-being* may be said *not* to involve the conception of manifestation at some point in time or for a limited period (and so in this sense it may be said *not* to occur in time and *not* to be conditioned by time), and, furthermore, psychologically normal humans who are not treading a Buddhist or similar Path never conceive it in the negative; contrariwise, being *qua* actuality is perceived as arising at some point in time and as dissolving at some point in time (even though often we close our eyes to this fact), which implies that all human beings can conceive it in the negative, for we think of an actual essent in terms of *either* being here at this moment or *not* being here at this moment, of *either* having been here at some point or *never* having been here, etc.

Since Kant and Heidegger always experienced being *qua* actuality in terms of the *phenomenon of being* / delusion of *self-being*, and since neither of them ever witnessed the dissolution of the delusion of self-being, both of them were unaware that the self-being was a mere illusion, both of them wrongly took actual / effective available essents to have self-being (Skt. *swabhava*; Tib. rangzhin[d]), and both of them explained effectiveness / actuality as though the term meant "self-being." For example, in the last of the above-quoted excerpts from works by Heidegger, the passage "*absolute positing* understood properly... means positing *qua*… *letting something stand of its own self* and *indeed absolutely*, as detached, set free as "*an und vor sich selbst*" (*in and for its own self*), as Kant says," rather

[a] Capriles (2005). The discussion in this respect will also be incorporated in the definitive version in print of Capriles (2004).
[b] Tib. *rang rgyud du khes len pa*.
[c] Tib. *gzhan ngo khas len*.
[d] *rang bzhin*.

than intended to describe *our delusive perception of available essents as involving self-being* (which, as we have seen, results from the delusory valuation-absolutization of the threefold thought structure to which the concept of being is inherent, together with the subtle / intuitive concept in terms of which the essent is normally perceived), was intended to describe what Kant categorized as *wirlich* (actual or effective).[135] Therefore, we must keep in mind that whenever Kant and Heidegger spoke of effectiveness or actuality (*Wirlichkeit*), they were actually referring to the delusion of self-being.

Of the three theses posited by Kant and enumerated above, the first means that being is not a concept of something that could be added to the concept of a thing—which is applicable both to the assertive proposition "A *is*" that, Kant believes, gives us being *qua* absolute position, and to the predicative, copulative usage of the verb "to be" in the proposition "A *is B*" that, according to Kant, gives us being *qua* mere position.[a136] The point is that when we say "A" we are already thinking A as something that *is*, and therefore adding the word "is" does not add anything to our understanding of A, which was already an understanding of A *as being*: the verb does not add a real predicate—not even the predicate of what Kant called actuality or effectiveness (*Wirlichkeit*) but which, as we have seen, he confused with the samsaric illusion of self-being (i.e. with what he called "absolute position" and did not realize to be an illusion). When we say "A *is* B," according to Kant "B" is a predicate that is added to the concept of the grammatical subject ("A") and that increases it (the assertion "Peter is tall" adds determinations to the noun "Peter"); however, the copula itself—the verbal form "is"—does not add anything to the grammatical subject of the proposition ("A"), for an expression like "the woman is beautiful" states exactly the same thing as "a beautiful woman."[137]

We have seen that the concept of being, which somehow also implies value and importance, is inherent in the threefold thought structure, which asserts that there is a *mental subject-that-is* (and that has value and importance), that there is an *experience-that-is* (and that has value and importance), and that there is an *object-that-is* (and that has value and importance), and that both the subject-object duality and the *phenomenon of being* result from the delusory valuation-absolutization of the super-subtle threefold thought structure. This delusory valuation-absolutization makes us experience the nonspatial and incorporeal phenomenon appearing as a mental subject (which, as briefly explained in a note to the preceding chapter, as will be explained in greater detail below, and as will be explained in even greater detail in Part II of this book, in no case can appear as object) in terms of the *phenomenon of being* and thus as a *self-existent*, *ultimately important perceiver-doer*; it sustains the notion of *experience* with the *phenomenon of being* and therefore makes it seem to *involve self-being and importance*; and it makes us experience the objects of our experience (which we perceive and on which we act) in terms of the *phenomenon of being* and hence as *involving self-being and importance*. Thus arises the ontic duality of the two most essential, delusive modes of being: that of the subject and that of the object (which will be considered below), which seem to be part of an absolutely true, objective reality.

Now we can have the final word concerning Kant's reduction to *perception* of both being *qua* actuality and being *qua* absolute position (two meanings of being that, as we have seen, since in his experience they were always mixed up, he designated by the single

---

[a] For a discussion of this, cf. Heidegger (1988), § 7, pp. 32-43 (pp. 43-57 of the original German Ed.). Cf. also the immediately following section of this work by Heidegger.

term “absolute position”). To begin with, he carried out this reduction because, due to the characteristics of his system, *it was mandatory to reserve the term* “*perception*” *for the apprehension of what is actual* / *effective*; therefore, he was far from being as ingenuous as a passage above in this section may have suggested. However, since metaphenomenological and truly phenomenological systems of philosophy are not entitled to take for granted either an extra-experiential phenomenal universe or the lack of it, they may not classify experiences in terms of whether of not they adequate or fail to adequate themselves to that universe; and since they do not presuppose a nonphenomenal *Ding-an-sich* or thing-in-itself, they may not classify phenomenal experiences in terms of whether or not the mechanisms whereby the psyche structures experience on the basis of *a priori* forms of sensibility are actually processing the *Ding-an-sich*, or of whether or not these mechanisms are applying the standard procedures that make intersubjective agreement possible.[138] Therefore, whenever the delusory valuation-absolutization of the threefold thought structure gives rise to the *phenomenon of being* and the subject-object duality with the object understood in terms of a delusorily valued-absolutized subtle / intuitive concept, metaphenomenological and truly phenomenological systems of philosophy must refer to the resulting experience by the term *perception*, *regardless of what the object’s status with regard to actuality be*—and this implies that they are forbidden to accept Kant’s reduction of being *qua* actuality to perception. What about Kant’s concomitant reduction of being *qua* absolute position to *perception*? If he had applied the term *perception* both to the apprehension of actual, effective objects, and to the apprehension of hallucinated objects, imagined objects, dreamed objects, and so on (as metaphenomenological systems are obliged to do insofar as we experience both the one and the other type of objects as *being* in the sense of *absolute position*), and if it were possible for human beings having never gone beyond experience in *nirvana* to distinguish being *qua* actuality from being *qua* absolute position, such beings would easily fall into the error of believing Kant was right in carrying out this reduction, for ordinary human beings are aware of perception, which gives them being *qua* absolute position, but not so of the stages in the process of arising of perception. In this process, firstly the delusory valuation of the threefold-thought structure gives rise in a simultaneous manner to the subject-object duality and the concomitant *phenomenon of being*, and only subsequently is the object understood in terms of a subtle / intuitive concept in what we call *perception*.[139] Hence genuinely metaphenomenological systems are not entitled to do what Kant did, but are obliged to acknowledge that being *qua* absolute position *arises previously to perception*: since the *phenomenon of being* and the concomitant subject-object duality are the *condition of possibility* of perception, the former are both ontologically and chronologically prior to the latter, and so we are not allowed either to reduce them to the latter or deem them to be a *product* of the latter. (All that was stated in this paragraph with regard to perception equally applies to knowledge, judgment and so on, for these are different instances of perception.)

As briefly shown in a note to the preceding chapter and as will be explained in a subsequent chapter of this book, the mental subject and its objects, both of which may be compared with images in a mirror, occur in a nondual awareness that, in turn, is comparable to a mirror. The phenomena appearing as object are extended and have features that may be perceived through one or more of the five senses accepted both by common sense and by Western philosophy, psychology and physiology (for example, material phenomena, as apprehended by the sense of sight, have form and color)—which is the reason why René Descartes believed them to be part of a *res extensa* or “extended thing.”

As we have seen, the phenomenon that we call the mental subject is not extended and has no features that may be apprehended through any of the five senses in question, for it is a mental appearance manifesting as subject and having a mode of appearing that is radically different from that of the phenomena that manifest as object: whereas the objects are appearances of the tsel[a] mode of manifestation of energy, the mental subject is an appearance of dang[b] energy—which is the reason why René Descartes categorized it as a *res cogitans* or "thinking thing" involving no extension. However, no matter how different their characteristics may be, the subject and its objects are alike in being appearances that occur in a nondual awareness, as reflections in a mirror that (in Longchen Rabjampa's words) "manifest clearly without existing anywhere, outwardly or inwardly,"[c] and are equally alike in not being a distance from the mirror-like nondual awareness in which they occur (just as the reflections in a mirror are *not* at a distance from the mirror). And yet, since tsel energy manifests as a seemingly external dimension with regard to which the phenomena of dang energy seem to lie in an internal dimension, the mental subject and its objects seem to be at an insurmountable distance from each other.

Moreover, the moment the subject-object duality comes into being, the mental subject seems to be a separate center of consciousness at a distance from objects and other subjects,[140] the Gnitive capacity of nondual awareness seems to be the cognitive capacity of that seemingly separate center of consciousness, and the spontaneity of nondual awareness (which to a limited degree it has the power to control) seems to be the capacity of action and manipulation of the seemingly separate and autonomous center of experience and action. Therefore, the mental subject seems to be one with human Gnitiveness, and the phenomena appearing as object seem to lie outside human Gnitiveness—which is one of the main reasons why René Descartes believed the *res cogitans* and the *res extensa* to be different substances. As will be shown in a subsequent chapter of this book, in the case of adult individuals, after the arising of the illusory mental subject, a process of singling out segments of the sensory continuum for perception comes into action together with a selective consciousness that experiences only the segment of the sensory continuum that has been singled out for perception and taken as figure, while leaving the rest of the sensory continuum as background—and the mental subject and this selective consciousness seem to be a single, self-existent essent. Finally, the mental subject reacts with the passions to whatever is singled out and which it believes to be external to itself. (It must be noted that the fact that the subject and its objects arise in the same nondual, mirror-like awareness does not imply a metaphysical theory concerning the existence or nonexistence of an outer world: insofar as we can only experience what manifests in our own awareness and cannot go beyond the latter in order to establish whether or not there is something outside it, we are not entitled to posit either a physical reality lying beyond awareness or the lack of such a reality. Therefore, in our own investigation we must keep what I have called the metaphenomenological *epoche*—which, unlike the phenomenological *epoche*, must acknowledge the illusory character of the mental subject and of objects seemingly at a distance from it.)

Above, it was noted that the most essential delusive modes of being were the being of the mental subject and the being of objects, which manifest when the delusory valuation

---

[a] *rtsal*.
[b] *gdangs*.
[c] Longchen Rabjam (2001b), p. 156.

of the threefold thought structure and of the concept of being inherent in it gives rise to the illusion of there being a self-existent mental subject, an experience involving self-being and an object involving self-being. With respect to the two modes of being which are the being of the mental subject and the being of objects, it is important to keep in mind that:

(1) The illusory being of the nonspatial, incorporeal phenomenon appearing as a mental subject we call the "perceiver-doer" (corresponding to what may be loosely identified as the "noetic pole of knowledge and action"), is the illusory being of what Descartes took to be a *res cogitans* and is what, in terms of traditional terminology, Sartre designated as *être-pour-Soi*—which I translate as *being-for-Self* rather than as the usual *being-for-itself*.[141]

(2) The illusory being of the spatial, corporeal phenomenon appearing as object (which corresponds to what may be loosely identified as the "noematic pole of knowledge and action"), is the illusory being of what Descartes took to be a *res extensa* and is what Sartre (also in traditional terms) called *being-in-itself*: the illusory being of the sensory continuum or *Vollgestalt* that is the matrix that human perception divides into figure and ground. The figure that is taken as object is automatically endowed with this mode of being, and hence it appears to be an entity involving self-being. Though Sartre referred to this mode of being as *being-in-itself*, insofar as it is only to *being-for-Self* that objects appear to be *in themselves*, instead of calling it *being-in-itself*, I will designate it as *being-that-being-for-Self-experiences-as-being-in-itself*.

The above two modes of being, which as we have seen occur only when delusion is active, are at once modes of being *qua* effectiveness or actuality, and modes of being *qua* the illusion of self-being (Skt. *swabhava*; Tib. rangzhin) that Kant called "absolute position." If we set out to provide a metaphenomenological definition of these two modes of being, not from the standpoint of being *qua* actuality, but from the standpoint of being *qua* the delusive appearance of absolute position or self-being, for the time being we will have to offer the reader two different modifications of Berkeley's formula, which are to be understood in terms of the way in which (as noted above) "the *phenomenon of being* is the being of the phenomenon:"

1) The *being* of the mental subject (i.e. of the illusory perceiver / doer which arises as a result of the delusory valuation-absolutization of the threefold thought structure, and which is the core of what Madhyamika philosophy calls "phenomena that are human beings" and that corresponds to the human existent that Heidegger called *Dasein* or "being there"[142]), in the sense of the delusion of absolute position or self-being, is its being sustained by the *phenomenon of being* (which, as we have seen, results from the delusory valuation of the threefold thought structure insofar as this thought structure involves the concept of being). It is this that causes each of us to experience our own mind as being ultimately, inherently a separate, autonomous, self-existent *mental subject or soul that is perceiving, acting, thinking*, and so on, and that thus gives rise to the illusion of being *qua* absolute position or self-existence, of what Descartes called *res cogitans*, corresponding to what Sartre called *being-for-Self*.
2) The *being* of available essents, and in general of what Madhyamika philosophy calls "phenomena that are not human beings," in the sense of the *delusion of absolute position or delusion of self-being*, lies in sustaining with the *phenomenon of being* the extreme of the threefold apparitional structure consisting in the

perceived / acted-upon, and as such corresponds to our perception of the phenomena we perceive, or on which we act, as *being* and as *having self-being*. Thus arises the illusion of being *qua* absolute position or self-being of what Descartes called *res extensa*, which corresponds to what Sartre called *être-en-soi*, but which, as noted above, I will designate as *being-that-being-for-Self-experiences-as-being-in-itself*.

Being and Nonbeing

We have seen that the *phenomenon of being*—the most basic manifestation of the error or delusion that Heraclitus called *lethe* and that the Buddha Shakyamuni called *avidya*—gives us the being of essents *qua* the delusive appearance that essents have a self-nature or self-being—which is what Chandrakirti, and later on Tsongkhapa, referred to as the [delusive appearance of] inherent existence. Now we must see that nothingness (in most senses of the term) and nonbeing are also given to us by the *phenomenon of being*.

In fact, it is the *phenomenon of being* that allows us to experience that an essent *is no longer*, or that—as would happen, for example, with a hare's horn—it *has never been*, etc. This is so because here we are dealing with an absence, and the perception of absences is a result of a negation carried out by the type of mental process that Freud called "secondary"[a][143] (associated mainly with the left cerebral hemisphere[144]), on the basis of the *phenomenon of being* generated by the delusory valuation-absolutization of the concept of being, which may be said to be more directly related to the mental process that Freud called "primary" (associated mainly with the right cerebral hemisphere). Since the negation that an essent is here at this moment, the negation that an essent continues to have being *qua* actuality, the negation of self-being, and in general all possible negations that may modify the concept of being, are sustained and made to wrongly appear as absolutely true, precisely by the *phenomenon of being*, these negations are secondary and superficial with regard to the *phenomenon of being*, to which they are subordinate.

Sartre explained a key sense of the term "nothingness" as consisting in "the presence of an absence." For example, if my wallet has been stolen but I have not become aware that it is not in my pocket, the wallet is absent, but this absence has not become present to me; however, if then I reach for my wallet and find my pocket is empty, the absence of the wallet becomes present to me. Therefore, if, following Sartre, we refer to this absence by the term "nothingness," this term will refer to the presence of the essent's absence. What is absent in this particular case is the manifestation of an essent's being *qua* actuality or effectiveness in a certain place, and what allows this absence to become present to me is what I have been calling the *phenomenon of being*—which, as we have seen, corresponds to being *qua* the delusion of self-being (*swabhava*)—and, on the basis of this *phenomenon*, the expectation of finding the wallet *qua* an actual object. The fact that perception of the absence of an essent's being *qua* actuality must necessarily be sustained by the *phenomenon of being* corresponding to being *qua* the illusion of self-being, and thus that the illusion of self-being is manifest at a time when being *qua* actuality is not manifest, demonstrates both the validity and the philosophical importance of the distinction between being *qua* the illusion of self-being *and* being *qua* actuality.

---

[a] Freud (1974).

Now suppose there was a fire in my office and I want to check whether or not a CD-ROM with important information was destroyed by the fire. I come into the office, go where I had left the CD-ROM, and in its place I find a lump of burnt synthetic material. Before this finding, the CD-ROM was already nonexistent *qua* CD-ROM, but the nonexistence of the CD-ROM *qua* CD-ROM was not present to me: it is the moment I perceive the lump, that the absence of the CD-ROM *qua* CD-ROM becomes present to me. In this case, what has become present is the absence of the essent's being *qua* actuality or effectiveness, not in a particular place, but in all possible places: what has shown itself to me is the fact that the essent no longer has being *qua* actuality or effectiveness anywhere in the universe. Just as in the preceding case, this proves both the validity and the philosophical importance of the distinction between being *qua* the illusion of self-being *and* being *qua* actuality.

Correspondingly, it may be said that the *phenomenon of nonbeing* is the presence of the absence of the supposed self-being of essents,[145] and therefore that nonbeing directly refers to being. Thus, whereas the *phenomenon of being* gives us the illusion of absolute position or self-being (Skt. *swabhava*; Tib. rangzhin[a]) of essents, the *phenomenon of nonbeing* is the realization that absolute position or self-being is no more than an illusion: it is the presence of the absence of being *qua* absolute position or self-being, which the Madhyamaka school of Mahayana Buddhism designates by the Sanskrit term *swabhava shunyata* (Tib. rangzhinggyi tongpanyi[b]; Mandarin, *k'ung*; Jap. *ku*), and which here I am expressing by the unusual term "emptiness or voidness of self-being". As will be shown below upon analyzing it in greater detail, the *phenomenon of nonbeing* can only manifest so long as the *phenomenon of being* is manifest, for it is a secondary process modification of the latter. However, this is not the only conception of nothingness or voidness found in Mahayana and other higher forms of Buddhism, and so at this point we must make a brief detour in the course of our research in order to review the four main such notions found in these forms of Buddhism:

(1) The one posited by the Yogachara School of philosophy, which consists in the nonexistence of essents externally to or independently of mind or experience. If taken to mean that there is no basis of experience that is not itself experience(d), this concept of voidness would violate the metaphenomenological *epoche* and as such would not fit into the philosophical view expressed in this book. If taken to mean that all that we experience is experience, it would be a truism. Therefore, it will not be further considered here.

(2) The one explained in paragraph before last, shared by all subschools of the outer, coarse Madhyamaka (Tib. Chi ragpai uma[c]) or "Madhyamaka positing the emptiness of self-being" (Skt. Swabhava Shunyata Madhyamaka; Tib. Uma Rangtongpa[d][146]), which includes the Prasangika and the different brands of Swatantrika, and which here I am expressing by the term *emptiness of self-being* (Skt. *swabhava shunyata*; Tib. rangzhinggyi tongpanyi[e]).

[a] *rang bzhin*.
[b] *rang bzhing gyis stong pa nyid*.
[c] *phyi rags pa'i dbu ma*.
[d] *dbu ma rang stong pa*. Madhyamaka (noun) and Madhyamika (adjective) are the Sanskrit terms rendered by the Tibetan *dbu ma*, whereas Rangtongpa is Tibetan for "adhering to emptiness of self-being."
[e] *rang bzhing gyis stong pa nyid*.

(3) The inner, subtle Madhyamika (Tib. Nang trawai uma[a])[147] concept that gives its name to the school Tibetans refer to as Zhentongpa[b], which is that of "emptiness of extraneous substances" (Skt. *paravastushunyata*[c]; Tib. zhengyi ngöpo tongpanyi[d]) and which refers to the fact that there is nothing extraneous to the single true essence and nature of reality. In this brand of Madhyamaka this concept complements (2) the one expressed by the Sanskrit term *swabhava shunyata* (Tib. rangzhinggyi tongpanyi[e]).

(4) Finally, one that roughly speaking may subsume the concept of ngowo or "essence" in the Dzogchen teachings and the notion expressed by the Mandarin term *wu* and the Japanese word *mu* in Taoism and in Ch'an / Zen Buddhism. As we have seen, the ngowo aspect of the Base in the Dzogchen teachings is compared to the no-thing-ness of a mirror, understood as that which allows it to fill itself with any appearance whatsoever, and to continue to [be] no-thing-ness while it is filled with an appearance; in their turn, the Mandarin term *wu* and the Japanese word *mu*, which are usually rendered as "nothingness," are posited of the Tao or true nature of reality insofar as this nature is not an essent or something that can be conceived by thought or experienced in terms of thought, and it is open to all possibilities.

The fact that (4) all phenomena occur depending on the no-thing-ness of the ngowo aspect of the Base or on the *wu* or *mu* character of the Tao (as well as on the rest of phenomena: in logical terms, insofar as these provide contrast, analogy and so on, which are the condition of possibility of definition; in physical terms, insofar as the universe is a net of interdependencies) implies (2) nonbeing in the sense of emptiness of self-being (i.e. of the fact that absolute position or self-being is an illusion, whether or not we realize this fact). In their turn, (4) the fact that all phenomena manifest depending on the no-thing-ness of the ngowo aspect of the Base or on the *wu* or *mu* character of the Tao, and (2) the fact that all essents lack self-being and thus do not have a nature different from the single true nature of all reality, imply (3) voidness in the sense associated to the Tibetan term zhengyi ngöpo tongpanyi [f], or, which is the same, the absence of anything other than what the Dzogchen teachings call the Base and which Taoism and often also Ch'an / Zen Buddhism call the Tao. Thus all senses of voidness or nothingness in higher Buddhist vehicles, except for (1) the one posited by the Yogachara school, imply each other and are mutually dependent on each other.

In the preceding section, we saw that, according to Kant, the notion that we call *being*, in the sense of absolute position or self-being (which he wrongly identified as actuality or effectiveness), is not added to the subject of a proposition by the use of a verbal form of the verb "to be:" before we hear or read the verbal form that follows the grammatical subject in the proposition (and therefore independently of whether or not the verbal form is included in the proposition), we already understand the grammatical subject as *being* in the sense of absolute position or self-being. However, when we begin to read or hear a proposition with regard to grammatical subject A, we still do not know that subject's

---

[a] *nang phra ba'i dbu ma*.
[b] *gzhan stong pa*.
[c] I have not found the Sanskrit term for *gzhan gyi dngos po stong pa nyid*; however, since *gzhan stong* renders the Skt. *parashunya*, one may infer that *gzhan gyi dngos po stong pa nyid* might have been a translation of *paravastushunyata* or another similar compound term.
[d] *gzhan gyi dngos po stong pa nyid*.
[e] *rang bzhing gyis stong pa nyid*.
[f] *gzhan gyi dngos po stong pa nyid*; Skt. *paravastushunyata*?

status concerning being *qua* actuality: we do not as yet know whether or not the grammatical subject is presently manifest, and only when we learn the tense of the verbal form might we come to know whether it is or not manifest[148]—and, if this verbal form is in the present tense, when we learn whether or not it is modified by a negative adverb. Therefore, the distinction between being *qua* absolute position or self-being and being *qua* actuality, made by Madhyamika philosophy but ignored by Kant, is the key to this discussion: being *qua* absolute position or self-being does *not* depend on (and is not even conveyed by) the presence of the verbal form in a proposition; it depends on the delusory valuation-absolutization of the supersubtle thought structure that I am calling "threefold thought structure" and nothing else. Contrariwise, being *qua* actuality *depends on the delusory valuation of the coarse, discursive thought expressed by the verbal form*, for when this form is in the present tense and is not modified by a negative adverb, we think the grammatical subject as presently having being *qua* actuality, and when the verbal form is in the past or future tense, or when, being in the present tense, it is modified by a negative adverb, we *might* think of the subject in question as presently not having being *qua* actuality.[149] The point is that the understanding of delusorily valued-absolutized coarse, discursive thoughts is directly related to what Freud called secondary process, which involves negatives and determines verbal tense and mode, whereas the understanding of delusorily valued supersubtle thought structures is directly linked to primary process, which does not involve negatives and does not determine verbal tense and mode (these two processes and the ways of functioning of the corresponding brain hemispheres will be discussed in greater detail in Parts II and III of this book).

Now we can add further precision to the statement that being is more basic than nonbeing, and relate it to the statement that nonbeing results from an operation carried out by what Freud called secondary process on the basis of the *phenomenon of being*. The being that is more basic than nonbeing is being *qua* absolute position or self-being; with regard to being *qua* absolute position or self-being, being *qua* actuality is just as secondary as nonbeing *qua* lack of actuality: both of these depend on operations of secondary process carried out on the basis of the more primary *phenomenon of being* which, as we have seen repeatedly, corresponds to being *qua* absolute position or self-being. As we have also seen, in order to establish being *qua* actuality or nonbeing *qua* lack of actuality one must check *whether or not* an essent is there as an *actual* entity, and this operation can only be carried out by secondary process, which alone can entertain negation and alone establishes verbal tense and mode.

However, the fact that the relevance of the distinction between being *qua* actuality and being *qua* absolute position of self-being has been made clear, rather than validating Je Tsongkhapa's view that being *qua* absolute position or self-being must be refuted and being *qua* actuality must be conserved, actually refutes his position, for in the process of evidencing the relevance of the distinction, it has been shown that it is impossible to do away with the illusion of self-being while conserving being *qua* actuality. Furthermore, Gendün Chöphel's objection that, as the etymology of the Sanskrit term *samvriti* [which as we have seen is "obscuration to correctness" or "thoroughly confused"] shows, the being *qua* actuality that makes up relative truth is as delusive as being *qua* absolute position or self-being, has been made far more clear in the process of evidencing the relevance of the distinction between these two modes of being (so to call them), for it has been shown that being *qua* actuality is the result of a secondary operation on the basis of being *qua* absolute

position or self-being, and therefore that it could not be entertained without the latter and that it is less authentic than the latter.[150]

Now let us further consider nonbeing in the sense of the realization of the absence of being *qua* absolute position or self-being expressed by the Sanskrit term *swabhava shunyata*, the Tibetan term rangzhinggyi tongpanyi[a], the Chinese term *k'ung* and the Japanese term *ku*, as understood by the Madhyamaka Rangtongpa[b] sub-schools of Buddhist philosophy—which, as shown above, in Sartrean terminology may be defined as the presence of the absence of self-being, and which shows self-being to be a mere illusion. Only a dissolution of the *phenomenon of being* that may have occurred in the *past*, or the impairment in the *present* of the second and third of the senses the terms *avidya* and marigpa have in the threefold classification chosen here (as we have seen, the second is the illusion of absolute position or self-being of essents, and the third consists in the illusion that this illusion is an objective, absolute reality), may allow us to understand, by means of an operation of secondary process and at a time when the *phenomenon of being* is manifest, that no matter how true the illusion of absolute position or self-being of essents may have seemed to be in our ordinary experience, it is never true, but always an illusion. It must be clear that here I am referring to two distinct possibilities:

(1) We know that the illusion of absolute position or self-being of essents (including the essent that *we are*)[151] is dependent on our experience of them as being in themselves separate from the rest of the sensory continuum, which in turn depends on the sharpness of the figure-ground distinction. Therefore, if, while the *phenomenon of being* is manifest, a panoramification / permeabilization of the focus of conscious attention[152] dissolves or impairs the figure-background distinction, by means of secondary process and on the basis of the *phenomenon of being* we may come to have a glimpse of the fact that the appearance of absolute position or self-being of essents is an illusion. Since the glimpse of nonbeing *qua* voidness is sustained by the *phenomenon of being*, just as is the case with the presence of the absence of an essent explained by Sartre, nonbeing is secondary and superficial with regard to being, and is an elaboration on the basis of being.

(2) The *phenomenon of being* and the ensuing illusion of self-being dissolve in the realization of the absolute truth of Madhyamaka, or in the occurrence of the state of rigpa or Awake awareness of the Dzogchen teachings (which, as we know, makes the true condition of the Base patent). Then, when the *phenomenon of being* arises anew, in contrast with the self-evidently true condition that unconcealed itself upon the dissolution of the *phenomenon of being*, the illusion of self-being in terms of which we again come to experience all essents is realized to be dream-like: on the basis of the *phenomenon of being*, we realize the appearance of self-being to be delusive.[153] Since what the Dzogchen teachings call the Base and what the Madhyamaka school calls the true nature of phenomena (Skt. *dharmata*; Tib. chönyi[c]) and identifies as the absolute truth (is) the unmade, unconditioned true nature of everything, the *phenomenon of being* that in *samsara* conceals this unmade, unconditioned true nature is the elaboration responsible for producing the illusion of the conditioned and made, and as such it is secondary and superficial with regard to the realization of the unmade, unconditioned true nature of everything. However, the *recognition* of nonbeing *qua* voidness of self-being that takes

[a] *rang bzhing gyis stong pa nyid*.
[b] *rang stong pa*.
[c] *chos nyid*.

place when the *phenomenon of being* is again manifest, being an elaboration based on the *phenomenon of being*, is secondary and superficial with regard to *being*.

Thus, both in the cases of (1) and (2), the realization of the fact that the illusion of absolute position or self-being was never true, is sustained by the *phenomenon of being*. However, on the Path, in general (1) occurs before (2), and it is in (1) that those individuals that, according to the Mahayana and higher vehicles, have "lower capacities" (and in particular the shravakas or "listeners" of the Hinayana), may experience the terror of the emptiness of self-existence of essents that I call *pan*ic (i.e. "irrational" dread in face of the patency of totality represented by the Greek god Pan and the associated intuition of the insubstantiality of all essents)[154]—which, like all passions, consists in a specific kind of thoughts sustained by a particularly pronounced manifestation of the *phenomenon of being*. Insofar as dread is an exacerbation of the *phenomenon of being*, the greater the horror of voidness, the greater our need to confirm as true the illusion of self-being—but since in (1) the mechanisms responsible for producing the second and third of the senses the term *avidya* has in the threefold classification chosen here have been impaired, this may result in a positive feedback loop of dread, distress and despair. As will be shown in chapter VIII of this book, in the gradual Mahayana the propensity for experiencing this dread is said to be overcome in the third of the four levels of the path of preparation,[155] in which the practitioner is supposed to become increasingly familiar with the absence of self-existence that previously inspired fear, and finally overcome fear of emptiness.

To conclude with this subject, the *Bhavanakramas* by Shantarakshita and Kamalashila, belonging to the lower Madhyamaka Swatantrika Yogachara school, assert that nonbeing in the sense of Madhyamika voidness manifests as a result of the analysis of the mode of existence of objects corresponding to the practice of insight (Skt. *vipashyana*; Tib. lhantong[a]) taught in these texts. In their turn, Je Tsongkhapa's *Lamrim* works assert it to occur as a result of the analysis taught in his own texts, in which he adapted the practice of insight characteristic of the *Bhavanakramas* to the theoretical tenets of Prasangika Madhyamaka. Finally, one of the twenty-one semdzin[b][156] belonging to the *Upadeshavarga* or Menngagde[c] series of Dzogchen teachings, which consists in a practice very similar to the ones taught in the *Bhavanakramas* and in the *Lamrim* works, is known to effectively induce experiences of voidness. However, the Dzogchen teachings make it clear that these are nyam[d] or "illusory experiences" comparable to reflections in a mirror, the only value of which is that those having the Dzogchen transmission and knowing the necessary instructions, may use these experiences as access gates to the discovery of the Awake awareness in which they occur, which in the simile is represented by the mirror. On the contrary, the *Bhavanakramas* and the *Lamrim* works assert that steadily abiding in the perception of voidness that manifests as object at the term of the analysis—which insofar as it is produced by the delusory valuation-absolutization of an intuitive / subtle concept, and insofar as it involves the subject-object duality and the delusion of self-being, is an instance of human delusion pertaining to *samsara*—is the absolute truth of the Madhyamaka.[157] As I made it clear in the Editor's Introduction to the English translation of

---

[a] *lhag mthong* (Pali, *vipassana*; Chinese, *kuan*; Jap. *kan*).
[b] *sems 'dzin*.
[c] *man ngag sde* or *man ngag gyi sde*.
[d] *nyams*.

Gendün Chöphel's *Ludrub Gonggyen*[a],[b] the original method of Prasangikas, rather than being the one taught in the *Bhavanakramas* or the adaptation of this method to some theoretical tenets of Prasangika Madhyamaka carried out by Je Tsongkhapa in his *Lamrim* works, was that of "thoroughly nonabiding Madhyamikas." This method consisted in "pulling the conceptual carpet from under the mind's feet" and in this way hindering the mechanisms that produce the second and third of the senses the terms *avidya* and marigpa have in the threefold classification chosen here (respectively responsible for producing and sustaining the illusion of substantiality), and thus inducing what in psychiatric language may be referred to as a *derealization*[158]—which is a samsaric experience, but which, if correctly steered by a Master, may result in a powerful and some times relatively long-lived manifestation of the true absolute truth of Madhyamaka.[159] Instances of nonbeing like those described above under (1) range from short-lived perceptions of voidness as object resulting from a Dzogchen semdzin or from a practice of insight like the ones taught in the *Bhavanakramas* and the *Lamrim* texts, to the more radical and longer-lasting derealizations which we have just considered (and which, it must be emphasized, involve a considerable increase in energetic-volume-determining-the-scope-of-awareness).[160] However, *in themselves*, the experiences of nonbeing are in no case the absolute truth of Madhyamaka or the Awake awareness the Dzogchen teachings call rigpa.

The Verbal Form

The discussion so far has shown that our conception of essents as absolute position or self-being does not depend on whether we think, pronounce, hear or read the word *being*, and that, nonetheless, the presence of a verbal form of the verb "to be" in assertive propositions is not at all superfluous. For example, when in an assertive proposition the verbal form is in the present tense and is not modified by a negative adverb, it is making the point that the grammatical subject has being *qua* actuality, and when it is in the past or in the future tense, or if it is in the present tense but is followed by a negative adverb, it is indicating that the grammatical subject presently lacks being *qua* actuality—and therefore in assertive propositions the characteristics of the verbal form determine the grammatical subject's condition regarding being *qua* actuality, thus adding a determination to it. As we have seen, it is only with regard to being *qua* absolute position or self-being that the verbal form does not add anything to the concept of a thing; however, Kant could not make this specification because, since in his experience being *qua* absolute position or self-being had always been mixed with being *qua* actuality and confused with it, he used the terms being *qua* absolute position and [being *qua*] actuality as synonyms. In fact, despite the fact that the verbal form in assertive propositions determines being *qua* actuality but does not affect being *qua* absolute position or self-being, which corresponds to the *phenomenon of being*, reading or hearing the noun being, and *in some cases* even reading or hearing the verbal form, elicits in us the phenomenon in question. This is so because in ordinary human beings the conception of being *qua* actuality is always mixed with that of being *qua* absolute position or self-being in a way that may be compared to that in which, upon thinking, pronouncing, hearing or writing the word "tomato," a representation manifests to our mind in which the vegetable's shape is indissolubly mixed with the color red.

---

[a] *klu sgrub dgongs rgyan*.
[b] Gendün Chöphel (2005).

Therefore, Heidegger was right when he asserted that thinking, hearing or reading the word *being* elicits in us a precise understanding (which, as we have seen, does not happen with words such as kzomil).

However, things are altogether different in the case of fully Awake Ones or in that of higher bodhisattvas[161] in their Contemplation state, for both of them are free from the illusion of being *qua* absolute position or self-being, and thus when they hear the word being or the various persons and tenses of the corresponding verbal form, they will *not* conceive the *phenomenon of being*. Furthermore, insofar as Awake Ones and superior bodhisattvas in the Contemplation state are free from relative truth as well, they *do not perceive* being *qua* actuality. However, in spite of not perceiving being *qua* actuality, in their practical life fully Awake Ones spontaneously distinguish what is actual from what is not actual in an incomparably more effective way than do normal individuals, and when it is convenient they can convey this distinction to others (though, as we have seen and as I have shown in greater detail elsewhere,[a] when they do so they do not generate what Chandrakirti called "own-mind:" their assertions are not of the type that has been called *self-directed* or *interior-directed*,[b] but of the kind that, in the lack of a more precise term, has been referred to as *other-directed* or *exterior-directed*[c]). Finally, superior bodhisattvas in their post-Contemplation state, upon hearing the word being, will conceive the *phenomenon of being*, and in the case of the verbal form in assertive propositions, if it is in the present tense and it is not followed by a negative adverb, they will conceive being *qua* actuality as well—which just as in the case of individuals who have not reached the third path and the corresponding first level, will be sustained by the *phenomenon of being* and hence will be mixed with being *qua* absolute position or self-being. However, when in the post-Contemplation state of superior bodhisattvas the *phenomenon of being* arises, it does so with lesser strength than ordinary individuals—or, at any rate, with some awareness of the illusoriness of what they are conceiving.

Contrariwise, in the copulative use of the verb "to be" (for example, in those statements asserting that the grammatical subject is tall or short, red or blue, etc.), though we think that subject as *inherently* tall or short, *inherently* red or blue, and so on, as Kant was right in observing, the verbal form will not tell us whether or not the grammatical subject has being *qua* actuality, for the fact that the subject in question is tall or short, red or blue and so on has nothing to do with whether or not it has being *qua* actuality. And this, in turn, leads into the problem that will be discussed in the following section of this chapter.

Two Views Concerning the Meaning of the Term "Reality"

In the discussion of being *qua* perception we saw that Kant asserted being not to be a *real* predicate, and that he equated being *qua* actuality or effectiveness with perception. However, in the same discussion we also saw that, since both in the case of a hallucinated stone and in that of what common sense calls an actual stone we perceive a stone as *an actual or effective stone*, and yet the hallucinated stone cannot break someone's head whereas what common sense calls "an actual stone" can break his or her head, *perception*

---

[a] Capriles (2005) and upcoming definitive version of Capriles (2004).
[b] *rang rgyud du khes len pa*.
[c] Tib. *gzhan ngo khas len*.

cannot be the criterion for actuality.[162] Both with regard to Kant's assertion that being is not a real predicate, and with regard to the difference between the hallucinated stone and the one that common sense regards as "real," the meaning given to the term "reality" is determinant.

Kant conceived reality as *quidditas* (that which must be determined in order to reply to the question "what") or, which is the same, as *essence*—a conception that, according to Heidegger, Kant had borrowed from Wolff's disciple, Baumgarten,[163] and which had been common currency in Scholasticism:[a164]

> When Kant talks about the *omnitudo realitatis*, the totality of all realities, he means not the whole of all essents actually available but, contrariwise, the whole of all possible thing-determinations, the whole of all thing-contents / reality-contents, essences, possible things. Accordingly, [in Kant's special jargon] *realities* is equivalent to Leibniz' term *possibilitas*, possibility. Realities are the what-contents (i.e. the quidditative contents) of possible things in general without regard to whether or not they are actual, or "real" in our modern sense (note: which corresponds to *effective*, and which may include the more precise sense Heidegger gives the term in a quotation from *Being and Time* included below). [Kant's] concept of reality is equivalent to the concept of the Platonic *idea* as that pertaining to an essent which is understood when I ask: *Ti esti*, *what* is the essent? The what-content (i.e. the quidditative content) of the thing, which Scholasticism calls the *res*, then gives me the answer.

Thus what Kant called reality is what, as we have already seen, he called "position" (as different from "absolute position," which was the mixture of being *qua* actuality and being *qua* the illusion of self-being exhaustively considered in this chapter). However, Kant noted that besides asking what is posited, I can ask *how* it is posited, and in this case, despite the fact that one hundred imaginary talers are not different in their reality (in the Kantian sense of the term) from one hundred actual talers, there is a radical difference between the ones and the others. In fact, in Kant's time and place, when talers were official currency in various German states, one hundred actual talers had actuality or effectiveness, among other senses, in the sense of allowing people to buy actual things or pay for actual services and so on. Therefore the third of the theses by Kant that were discussed in the section *Being and Perception*, which was a question, is answered by stating that *in the sense Kant gives the term "reality,"* there is nothing more in hundred actual talers than in the same amount of imaginary talers, and nonetheless *in what concerns effectiveness or actuality* there are hundred talers in the former but nothing at all in the latter.

The illusion of self-being which I am referring to in Kantian terms by the label "being *qua* absolute position," like Kant's conception of "reality," does not depend on whether or not an essent has being *qua* actuality: in previous sections it was shown that, unlike being *qua* actuality, being *qua* absolute position / illusion of self-being is not conditioned by time (i.e. by whether an essent already came into being and has not yet ceased to be, whether it has not yet arisen, or whether it occurred but already ceased to be) and therefore normal, ordinary human beings do not think in the negative. In a previous section this led us to conclude that Kant was wrong in equating being *qua* absolute position

[a] Heidegger (1988), § 7, p. 34 (45-46 of the original German Ed.). Among other changes I made to Hofstadter's translation, I replaced "beings" with "essents," "extant" with "available," "real-contents" with "reality-contents," "just the reverse" with "contrariwise..."

with being *qua* actuality; however, we must not jump into the opposite conclusion and assert that being *qua* absolute position corresponds to *quidditas* or *essence* (i.e. to what Kant called "reality"), for, as we have seen repeatedly, what corresponds to essence is "mere position" rather than "absolute position." In conclusion, being *qua* absolute position / self-being does *not* correspond either to what Kant called effectiveness / actuality, or to what he referred to by the term "reality."

In *Being and Time* Heidegger used the term "reality" in a sense that was the very opposite of the one shared by Scholasticism, Baumgarten and Kant: rather than lying in a concept's quidditative content and as such corresponding to essence, it roughly corresponded to effectiveness or actuality, and, since in the experience of ordinary beings having never gone beyond *samsara*, effectiveness or actuality is indissolubly mixed with the illusion of self-being, he repeated Kant's error, encoding it in his own, opposite terminology: instead of speaking of the identity of *actuality* with *absolute position*, Heidegger spoke of the identity of *reality* with *substantiality* (the latter not being an exact synonym of "self-being" or "absolute position," yet embracing the meaning of these terms). Let us consider his explanation of what happens when, in the terminology of *Being and Time,*[165] in our understanding the world according to the mode of being of "falling prey" (*Verfallen*),[166] *being* takes on the character of *reality*:[a167]

> Here the being of things initially at hand is passed over and essents are first conceived as a context of things (*res*) objectively present. Being acquires the meaning of *reality*.[168] Substantiality becomes the basic characteristic of being…
>
> But intuitive cognition has always been viewed as the way to grasp what is real… Since the character of the in-itself and the independence belongs to reality, the question of the possible independence "from consciousness" of what is real, or of the real possible transcendence of consciousness in the "sphere" of what is real, is coupled with the question of the meaning of reality. The possibility of an adequate ontological analysis of reality depends on how far that *from which* there is independence, *what* is to be transcended, is *itself* clarified with regard to its *being*.

We have seen that the delusion that we call "being" implies the illusion of absolute position, self-being or *swabhava*, which causes us to experience all essents as *being in themselves*. In the experience of "reality" (in Heidegger's sense of the word, which according to him was the twentieth century sense of the term[169]) we are dealing with a world of actual or effective essents which we experience as having already being there when we came into being, as "offering resistance" to us, and as something that we cannot modify through our imagination. Like all deluded beings, Heidegger experienced the essents he called *innerworldly* as *being in themselves*, independently of human consciousness, and said this happens when they *manifest as reality*. This is why common sense does not need the independent existence of the essents in question to be proven:[b]

> Correctly understood, *Dasein* (the being of human existents) defies such proofs [aimed at demonstrating the independence of reality with regard to consciousness], because it

[a] Heidegger (1996), pp. 187 (first paragraph in the quote) and 188 (second paragraph in the quote). Original German edition: pp. 201 and 202. I changed some words in order to adapt the quotation to the terminology used in this book.
[b] Heidegger (1996), p. 190. Original German edition: p. 205.

always already *is* in its being what the later proofs first deem necessary to demonstrate for it.[170]

However, it must be clear by now that the delusion of being *qua* absolute position or self-being, and the mixture of this delusion with being *qua* actuality, is not limited to the experience of reality in the modern sense of the term: the delusory valuation-absolutization of the super-subtle thought structure called the "threefold thought structure," to which the concept of being is inherent, causes us to perceive whatever we perceive, hallucinate or imagine, as having self-being (which, as we have seen, is an appearance that, in the sense already considered, is beyond time), and the combination of this with the delusory valuation-absolutization of the subtle or intuitive thought in terms of which we have recognized the object we perceive, hallucinate or imagine, causes us to perceive it as *in itself being* this or that (in the terminology of Chandrakirti and Je Tsongkhapa, as *inherently being* this or that). Therefore, also when someone thinks of a hundred imaginary talers, or—to use a classic Tibetan example—when a person, after taking datura, has visions of ghosts or of illusory lands, the perception of being *qua* absolute position—i.e. the illusion of self-being or *swabhava*—and the perception of actuality are indissolubly mixed: the individual imagines the talers as involving self-being and also as being actual (i.e. as serving to pay for goods or services), and the same applies to the experience of the ghosts (which the individual may fear) and the illusory lands (through which the individual may try to walk) that arise as a result of the effects of the ingestion of datura. It is thus clear that the perception as actual realities and as involving self-being, both of the phenomena that Madhyamikas call effective or actual (those that human beings perceive in common as effective or actual), and of whatever we imagine or hallucinate (which is not perceived in common, but which is also perceived as effective or actual), is common currency so long as the basic delusion at the root of *samsara* continues to manifest.

There is, nevertheless, a fundamental difference between imagination and hallucination: in imagination we have the capacity to modify at will whatever we imagine, and we do not experience it as having already being there when we came into being, or as offering resistance to us;[171] on the contrary, ordinary human beings experience hallucinations just in the same way as they experience what Heidegger referred to by the word reality. Does this mean that hallucination and the perception of reality in Heidegger's sense are the same, whereas imagination is different from both of them? It is self-evident that, as we have seen repeatedly, a hallucinated stone would not break a human head if it were thrown at it, but what we call a "real" or a "physical" stone could certainly break it if it hit its target.[172] Therefore, it must be clear, not only that phenomena of no type whatsoever have self-being or substantiality, but that in the case of ordinary human beings (and despite the fact that they are unable to recognize a dream as being a mere dream, or a hallucination as being a mere hallucination) a clear distinction must be made between *actual phenomena*—those that are experienced in common by human beings and that produce effects equally experienced in common by human beings—and *ineffectual phenomena* such as those experienced in hallucination and so on. However, this distinction applies only to the experience of sentient beings: it does not apply to fully Awake Ones who, having obtained the *sambhogakaya*'s wisdoms of quality and quantity, have what samsaric beings would view as a "capacity of miracles."

III

Being as *lethe* or Concealment by Delusory-Valued Thinking, Vs *Aletheia* or the Non-concealment of the Unthinkable:

Heidegger's Mistaken Interpretation of Heraclitus and Eastern Thought, and some Buddhologists' Mistaken Interpretation of Heidegger

Heidegger's Contacts with Eastern Thought

Martin Heidegger had an exchange of views with a Theravada Buddhist monk. He studied the Taoist literature available in German during his lifetime and in association with a Chinese scholar carried out a partial translation into German of the *Tao-Te-Ching*. He most attentively studied the Japanese Zen Buddhist literature existing in German during his lifetime and had some contact with the famous D. T. Suzuki, and closer contact with H. Sh. Hisamatsu and several other Japanese practitioners of this discipline (which was one of the root sources of the Kyoto School of Japanese philosophy[173]). Furthermore, Chinese Taoism and Japanese Zen deeply affected him, having a direct influence on his thought and being the source of several references he used in his courses (so that these systems might have to a greater or lesser extent inspired his so-called *Kehre* or "turnabout").

The above, hitherto little-known facts are nowadays substantiated and discussed in an ample bibliography including dozens of rigorous studies in books and academic papers (these being so numerous that a whole section of the Bibliography of this book is devoted to them[174])—which in their turn were discussed, summarized and synthesized in at least two important books.[a] The debate as to the degree to which his Eastern sources influenced Heidegger's thought, which has been critical, serious and extremely well documented, began in the 1970s with the testimonies by Paul Shi-yi Hsiao,[b] Chung-yuan Chang[c] and H.

[a] These are: (1) Saviani (2004); and (2) May (1996).
[b] Hsiao (1977, 1987). Cited in Saviani (2004), p. 18.
[c] Chang (1977b). Cited in Saviani (2004), p. 18.

W. Petzet,[a] and with the translation of important studies by the Kyoto School.[b175] As Carlo Saviani notes,[c] the explicit references to the Taoist and Zen traditions in the works by Heidegger published so far are scarce; however, these references attest to the enormous importance he attributed to his Eastern sources. One of them reads:[d]

> The confrontation with the Asian was to the Greek being a fruitful necessity; today, for us, in a completely different way and in much greater dimensions, it is this that will decide the destiny of Europe and of what we call the "Western World."

Another one tells us:[e]

> ...every meditation on what today is, can arise and thrive, only if, through a dialogue with the Greek thinkers and with their language, it sinks its roots in the foundation of our historical existence. This dialogue is still waiting to be begun. It is just in the process of preparation, and it constitutes in its turn the condition for the indispensable (*unausweichlichte*) dialogue with the world of the Asian East.

In addition, another one says:[f]

> For the planetary construction encounters are imminent for which none of those who today go for them is prepared. This is true to the same degree for the European language and for the Asian one in general and, especially, for the ambit of their possible dialogue. Neither of the two, in fact, can open and found by itself this ambit.

Among the references to Taoist and Zen concepts found in Heidegger's work, consider the following:

> The term *Ereignis*... is so difficult to translate as the Greek word *logos* and the Chinese Tao.[g]

> Lao-tzu:[h] he who knows its luminosity wraps himself in its darkness.[i]

> The key word in the poetic thought of Lao-tzu is pronounced "Tao" and "properly" means "way." However, upon conceiving the way in a superficial manner as the stretch that links two places, the term has been hurriedly discarded. (...) Therefore "Tao" has been rendered as Reason, Spirit, Meaning, Logos. Nonetheless, the Tao could be the way that

[a] Petzet (1977), pp. 183-184, (1983), p. 65 and especially pp. 175-192. Cited in Saviani (2004), p. 18.
[b] Buchner (Ed. 1989).
[c] Saviani (2004).
[d] Heidegger (1992) (different Ed. cited in Saviani [2004]). The translation into English of the excerpt is my own.
[e] Heidegger (1954b); cited in Saviani (2004), p. 19. The translation into English of the excerpt is my own.
[f] Heidegger (1955), p. 424. Cited in Saviani (2004), p. 20. Author's translation of the excerpt.
[g] Heidegger (1957) (in Heidegger [1994], p. 125). Cited in Saviani (2004), p. 20. Author's translation of the excerpt.
[h] Lao-tzu, *Tao-Te-Ching*, ch. 28, trans. by Victor von Strauß.
[i] Heidegger (1958) (in Heidegger [1994], p. 93). Cited in Saviani (2004), p. 20. Author's translation of the excerpt.

puts all on-the-way-to (*der alles be-wëgende Weg*); (...) Perhaps in the word "way," Tao, the mystery of all mysteries of thoughtful saying may be hidden (...). All is way.[a]

However, he also warned that:[b]

> I am convinced that only starting from the same place of the planet where the technical modern world has been born, may an inversion also be prepared, and that it cannot be produced through the adoption of Zen Buddhism or of other Eastern experiences of the world. In order to change the way of thinking it is imperative for us to have the help of the European tradition, and to re-appropriate it. Thought is only modified by thought that has its same origin and its same destiny.

It was in the summer of 1946 that Heidegger, in association with Chinese scholar Paul Shih-yi Hsiao, undertook the above-mentioned translation of the *Tao-Te-Ching*—a work which emphasizes the notion of *wu* or Nothingness (*Nichts*) while "rejecting rationalism"[176] (two characteristics that, the Chinese scholar noted, matched Heidegger's ideas) and which, according to Hsiao, may have borne a crucial influence on the German philosopher's thinking.[c] However, in his account of his collaboration with Heidegger the Chinese writer and translator gives the impression that he cut short the project because Heidegger superimposed his own views on the German rendering of the text they were producing. He wrote:[d]

> I must admit that during our work I was unable to rid myself of some fear that Heidegger's notes could perhaps go beyond what is required in a translation. As interpreter and mediator, this tendency made me feel uneasy.

After giving a clear example of this, he continued:[e]

> After the summer of 1946 we did not resume our collaboration. Once, in the nineteen sixties, when a friend with whom I visited Heidegger mentioned the Lao-tzu, he pointed at me with his index with some emotion, as well as with a smile, and said: 'But it has been him who has not wanted to do it'.

Finally, he wrote:[f]

> I must acknowledge that in my translation of the Lao-tzu into Italian I didn't dare, I didn't even think of daring, to go beyond the words of the text. The two lines of chapter XV, translated literally, read: 'Who can, by calming, slowly clarify the murky? Who can, by moving, rekindle slowly the calm?' But [in our German translation] Heidegger went beyond, saying that clarifying at the end brings something to light, and that the imperceptible movement in quietude and in stillness can bring something to being.

---

[a] Heidegger (1959) (in Heidegger [1985], p. 187). Cited in Saviani (2004), p. 21. Author's translation of the excerpt.
[b] Heidegger (1976) (in Neske & Kettering, Eds. [1988], p. 107). Cited in Saviani (2004), p. 22. Author's translation of the excerpt.
[c] Neske (Ed. 1977), p. 127.
[d] Hsiao (1987), p. 98. Retranslated from Saviani (2004), p. 145.
[e] Retranslated from Saviani (2004), pp. 145-146.
[f] Retranslated from Saviani (2004), p. 148.

The last excerpt also shows that, while Heidegger may have believed there was a correspondence between his own thought and Lao-tzu's, in fact there was no such correspondence. It is worth noting that Heidegger's interest in Taoism was not limited to the thought of Lao-tzu, for there are testimonies attesting his interest in the *Chuang-tzu*: on one occasion, in a private gathering following a conference by Heidegger, the problem of whether or not a human being can put him or herself in the place of another came up, and as a reply Heidegger read from the *Chuang-tzu* the story "The joy of fishes;"[a] on another occasion, he included in a private seminar Chuang-tzu's story, "Carving the bell-stand";[b] and on yet another occasion, in a course for professors, from the same source he quoted in full the story, "The useless tree."[c]

Later on, Heidegger met Chung-yuan Chang, who in 1949 had participated in the international conference that took place in the University of Hawai'i, "Heidegger and Eastern Thought," and who subsequently wrote profusely on what he interpreted as the affinities between Taoism and Heidegger's writings. Chang refers to the 1954 Freiburg meeting between Heidegger and D. T. Suzuki (who, by the way, had been a schoolmate of Kyoto School philosopher Kitaro Nishida),[d] and also reminds us that, according to William Barrett, Heidegger declared:[e] [177]

> If I have understood [Dr. D. T. Suzuki's works on Zen Buddhism] correctly, [what he says] is the same that I have been trying to say throughout my writings.

He further tells us that Heidegger's American disciple J. G. Gray, author of an important contribution on the relationship between Heidegger and Eastern thought, told him that in Freiburg Heidegger had given him as a gift a book on Zen Buddhism.[f] And, what is far more important, Suzuki himself described at length his hour-long meeting with Heidegger, who told him he had read those books by the Japanese author that were available in German.[g] In his turn, C. F. von Weizsäcker tells us in the nineteen sixties Heidegger told him about the visit by an important Japanese exponent of Zen Buddhism (who most likely was D. T. Suzuki) and of the deep impression the Japanese caused on him. In fact, this impression was so profound that Heidegger told von Weizsäcker, "It was as though a door had been opened."[h]

The fact that Heidegger had read those books by Suzuki that were available in German is not surprising, and the possibility that Far Eastern thought may have had a determinant influence on his *Kehre* or "turnabout" must be seriously considered, for the German thinker had had direct contact with Japanese Zen Buddhists since 1921, when Tokuryu Yamanashi began attending his Freiburg courses. In 1922, Yamanashi's teacher,

---

[a] Petzet (1977). (Heidegger read the story from Buber, Martin, 1910/1921, *Reden und Gleichnisse des Tschuang-Tse*, p. 62. Leipsig.)
[b] Petzet (1977). This time Heidegger did not use the same source.
[c] Heidegger (1989).
[d] Chang (1970b), p. 66. Cited in Saviani (2004), p. 66.
[e] Barrett (Ed. 1956), p. xi. Also cited in Smith (1985), p. 11.
[f] Chang (1970). Cited in Saviani (2004), pp. 66-67.
[g] In Suzuki's notes on his trip through Europe, published in Kokoro magazine; now in Buchner (Ed. 1998), pp. 169-172 (under the title Erinnerung an einen Besuch bei Martin Heidegger). Cited in Saviani (2004), p. 78.
[h] Weizsäcker (1977), p. 247. Cited in Saviani (2004), n. 28, p. 30.

Kyoto School philosopher Hajime Tanabe, also visited Freiburg, discovering Heidegger and his thought. Then, in 1927, Heidegger met Count Shuzo Kuki, for whom he seems to have developed a deep-seated affection, and who was quite important both as a philosopher in his own right and as a teacher of Heidegger's thought in Japan (when he met Heidegger, he had already published his main work, *The Structure of Iki*[a]). Sh. Kuki spent a whole year with Heidegger in Marburg, and, according to Tomio Tezuka it was Kuki who first awoke the German philosopher's interest for Japan (Kuki met the young Sartre in France while looking for a teacher of French, and it was he who introduced the key existentialist philosopher to Heidegger's work, of which he was as yet unaware). Tezuka is "the Japanese" of the renowned "dialogue with the Japanese" Heidegger reconstructed in a well-known *Gespräch*[b] (and which, Heidegger acknowledged, may have given rise to projections and suggestions in the redaction of this work) and is also the author of two commemorative papers on Heidegger[c]—in one of which he testified that Heidegger expressed to him his interest in Zen and mentioned Suzuki Daisetz.[d]

In the thirties, Keiji Nishitani (Tsujimura's teacher and his predecessor in the Chair at Kyoto University) attended Heidegger's lessons on Nietzsche in Freiburg. Another Japanese student of Heidegger was Seinosuke Yuasa, who translated *Was ist Metaphysik* into Japanese as soon as the book appeared in Germany. Heidegger also had an important exchange of letters with Takehiko Kojima, published on Heidegger's initiative in the Swiss journal *Begegnung*. Then, on May 18, 1978, Heidegger and the Rinzai Zen monk Hoseki Shin'ichi Hisamatsu (known for his texts on the Buddhist notions of Nothingness, art and "atheism"[178]) led a brief seminar in which Koichi Tsujimura (Japanese philosopher and Zen practitioner, who stressed most the supposed affinity between Heidegger's thought and Zen, which he discussed at length, while nonetheless pointing out the difference between them[e]), Max Müller (one of the founders of Eastern studies and of comparative religion, translator of the *Upanishads*, director of the 50 works collection Sacred Books of the East, and whose works contrasting Indo-European and Semitic cultures gave rise to racist interpretations) and Egon Vietta (a pseudonym used by Swiss writer Karl Egon Fritz) also participated.[179] Heidegger concluded the seminar's dialogue with Hisamatsu on voidness in Japanese Zen art (available in various editions[f]) with the words:[g]

> It has been made clear that with our representations (that is, with the representation of a direct and continuous way) we [Europeans] cannot arrive where the Japanese already are. I would like to conclude with a *koan*, the favorite *koan* of Master Hakuin: (rising a hand) "Listen to the sound of one hand clapping."

---

[a] For a discussion of this concept cf. May (1996). Cf. Also Zolla (1994). (Zolla, who is connected with the Traditionalist Movement [cf. the notes to Part III of this book], seems to confuse the aim of Zen Buddhism and similar traditions with the condition the Dzogchen teachings call kunzhi [*kun gzhi*].)

[b] Heidegger (1953/54).

[c] Tezuka, Tomio (trans. E. Weinmayr), in Buchner (Ed. 1989): (1) Ein Stunde mit Heidegger, pp. 173-179; (2) Drei Antworten; pp. 179-180. References in Saviani (2004), p. 80. English (trans. G. Parkes) in May (1996), pp. 59-64.

[d] Cf. (1) in the preceding note.

[e] In Wisser (Ed. 1970), pp. 27-29. (Also in *GA 16*.)

[f] Guzzoni (1963); now in Buchner (Ed. 1989), pp. 211-15. Also in Saviani (2004).

[g] Saviani (2004), pp. 91-92.

Furthermore, Heidegger commissioned Koichi Tsujimura to deliver the concluding conference, called Vom Nichts im Zen, in the seminar, led by Heidegger, on Hegel's *Science of Logic*. Much later, the Japanese visited Heidegger in his refuge in the Black Forest on the occasion of the latter's eightieth birthday; in their conversation, Tsujimura attacked Descartes (whom Heidegger called "the father of the nuclear bomb") as the man responsible for completing the project of putting this world under the power of lineal reason's instrumentality and will for power, and expressed his agreement with Heidegger concerning the supreme value of letting nature be rather than trying to master it and thus destroying it.[a]

In his biography of Heidegger, H. W. Petzet devoted a 17 page section to Heidegger's interest in Eastern thought, which Petzet called The Monk from Bangkok,[b] for it dealt mainly with Heidegger's dialogue with Thai Theravada Buddhist monk Maha Mani. Their conversation took place in two episodes: an initial private one, and then a televised one. Heidegger asked what Easterners understood by meditation; Maha Mani replied, "recollectedness," and went on to explain that the more collected we become, the more, without an exertion of will, we "undo" (*ent-werde*) ourselves. He concluded: "At the end only Nothingness remains. However, Nothingness is not 'nothing', but its very opposite: plenitude (*die Fülle*). No one can name it. But it is, Nothing and All, full Realization." Petzet notes concerning Heidegger's reaction: "Heidegger has understood and says, 'This is what I have always said, all my life'." It is a fact that Heidegger's description, in *Being and Time*, of the avoidance of awareness of death, of *Angst* and so on as being the very root of inauthentic existence, could easily be related to all ways and schools of Buddhist thinking; in fact, this seems to be one of the reasons why various Westerners, including Buddhologist Stephen Batchellor,[c] set out to draw parallels between Buddhist thinking, on the one hand, and phenomenology and *Existenzphilosophie*—including Heidegger's systems[180]—on the other. (Karl Löwith has shown how, in the Nazi period, Heidegger used the *Dasein*'s being-toward-death in the context of a justification of the call to assume the most extreme risk for the sake of Germany, Nazism and the Führer;[d181] however, this distortion of Heidegger's original concept not obliterate its relation with Buddhist thought.)

Heidegger, Heraclitus and Buddhism

Heidegger was a devout student of Heraclitus' thought, which, as is nowadays well known, exhibits coincidences and parallels with the *Prajñaparamita sutras* of Mahayana Buddhism and the Madhyamaka School of philosophy based on these sutras, with other higher forms of Buddhism, and with analogous Eastern mystical traditions.[182] Rather than elucidating the coincidences between Heraclitus' philosophy and those Eastern ways of thinking that exerted a pull on Heidegger's own thought, the German philosopher misinterpreted Heraclitus' thought precisely with regard to the key points in which it coincided with Buddhism, making the Greek philosopher's thought, which had clear Dionysian roots, seem practically the same as that of the Eleatics, which exhibited clear Orphic roots (the Orphic tradition and the Dionysian one having been overtly hostile

---

[a] May (1996).
[b] Petzet (1983), pp. 175-192, Der Mönch aus Bangkok.
[c] Batchelor (1983).
[d] Löwith (1988); Vásquez (2005).

toward each other, just as Heraclitus' Dionysian-rooted philosophy was diametrically opposed to Orphic-derived systems, such as those of Pythagoras and Parmenides).[183] In fact, just like Mahayana Buddhists and other like-minded Asian mystics, Heraclitus was aware that all essents shared a single, true nature, which had neither *genus proximum* nor *differentia specifica* and which therefore could not be understood in terms of the contents of thoughts—which was the reason why Ashvagosha called it *achintya* or the unthinkable, and which was also the reason why Heraclitus consistently referred to it in contradictory terms. A most clear example of Heraclitus using contradiction to refer to the single, true nature of all essents, is fragment 10 DK, which reads:[a184]

> As a totality things are whole and non-whole, identical and non-identical, harmonic and non-harmonic; the one is born from the whole and from the one all things are born.

Another example is fragment DK 67, which reads:

> God (i.e. the *logos*) is day-night, winter-summer, war-peace, satiety-hunger [so that it simultaneously includes the extremes in all pairs of opposites; what of him we perceive] changes like fire, [the smell of which] is called according to the fragrance of the aromatic herbs [one throws on it].

The fact that the great Greek philosopher asserted contradictions such as the above and many others[185] does *not* mean that, like Hegel, he believed that the conceptual map could correspond to the territory but that, in order to do so, it had to contradict itself; contrariwise, all tends to suggest that, by juxtaposing contradictory terms and affirming both of them, he intended to break the intellect's attempt to understand the true nature of reality in terms of a concept or series of concepts. The first of the above fragments tells us that the whole cannot be conceptualized—which, as we have seen, is due to the fact that it is that which excludes nothing (it lacks *differentia specifica*), and that there is no wider category that may include it (it lacks *genus proximum*). It also tell us that when nevertheless we understand it as unity, from the whole the one is born, and that when we single out segments in the universal continuum, it is this concept of "one" that allows us to understand this continuum as a series of essents—for each of these may be understood as an essent insofar as it is understood as being *one*[186] (and it is the delusory valuation-absolutization of this that gives rise to the illusion of self-existent multiplicity). Therefore, from the [concept of] one "all things have been born." Nietzsche wrote:[b]

> Parmenides said, "one cannot think of what is not [and therefore all that we think must *truly be*]." We are at the other extreme, and say "what can be thought of must certainly be a fiction."

What Nietzsche referred to as the extreme opposite to Parmenides' is the one represented, among other systems, by views such as those expressed in Greece by Heraclitus, some of the Sophists and the Skeptics; in China by Lao-tzu and the other

---

[a] Based on Kirk's translation, in Kirk, Raven & Schofield (1970).

[b] Nietzsche (1968), Book III, Principles of a New Evaluation, 1, The Will to Power as Knowledge, 1, Method of Inquire, 539 (March-June 1888). I slightly modified the English; the words in brackets are my own addition, inserted in order to clarify Parmenides' statement as (in my view) Nietzsche understood it.

founding fathers of Taoism, and by the great Ch'an Buddhist Masters; and in India by the Madhyamaka philosophy founded by Nagarjuna. However, in the terminology of Nagarjuna, his own philosophy consisted in refuting what he called "the extremes"—all that results from the delusory valuation of concepts, which are extremes insofar as these are defined in contrast with their opposites—as a means to lead beings beyond all interpretations of the universe, into the "Middle Way" consisting in the state of Awakening wherein no interpretation is taken to be either true or false. As shown in the preceding chapter, being and nonbeing have the same root, for the delusory valuation of the concept of being gives rise to the *phenomenon of being*, and only when this phenomenon sustains a secondary process negation can nonbeing manifest in any of its modalities. Therefore, to believe that the true nature of the cosmos may be expressed in terms of the concept of being is a typical example of the delusion Shakyamuni called *avidya* and Heraclitus called *lethe*, resulting from the delusory valuation of thought—and exactly the same applies to thinking that the nature in question may be expressed in terms of the concept of nonbeing… or of any other concept, for that matter, including logically inadmissible combinations of concepts such as both-being-and-nonbeing or neither-being-nor-nonbeing. In fact, Nagarjuna's *chatushkoti* (Tib. muzhi[a]) or simultaneous negation of all possibilities regarding a topic—namely the four inadmissible extremes consisting in nonbeing, not-nonbeing, being-and-nonbeing, and neither-being-nor-nonbeing—arose because, upon the exclusion of all possible conceptual positions, the mind is left with nothing to hold to and therefore has the possibility of dissolving[187] together with the delusory valuation of thought—upon which the true nature of all entities, which cannot be expressed in terms of any of the four extremes or of any other concept, may be directly, nakedly realized beyond the subject-object duality.[188]

Mahayana Buddhism and the other traditions that emphasized the fact that the true nature of all essents was unnamable and unthinkable, nonetheless called it by many names, which could be referred to as the "manifold names of the unnamable:" absolute condition, thatness (*tathata*), nature of phenomena (*dharmata*);[189] *tao*,[190] Buddha-nature (*buddhata*, *tathagatagarbha*, *bhutatathata*), *Shiva*,[191] *brahman-atman*,[192] bön[b],[193] *Zurvan*,[194] etc.[195] While the Dzogchen teachings called it Dzogchen (which in this case is to be understood *qua* Base [Tib. zhi[c]]), *bodhichitta*, thigle chenpo, and so on,[196] Heraclitus called it *physis*, *logos* and *pyr*. Though this nature (is) in itself unfragmented and, as stressed by Mahayana Buddhism, (is) unproduced / unbecome / uncaused (Pali *abhèta*; Skt. *anutpada*, *anutpatti*; Tib. makyepa[d]), unborn (Pali and Skt. *ajata*; Tib. makyepa[e]) and unconditioned / uncompounded / unproduced / unmade / uncontrived (Pali, *asankhata*; Skt., *asamskrita*; Tib., dümaje[f]),[197] our distorted, delusory experience of it while in *samsara* is both fragmentary and produced / caused (Pali *bhèta*; Skt. *nutpada* or *nutpatti*; Tib. kyepa[g]), born (Pali and Skt. *jata*; Tib. kyepa[h]), or compounded / conditioned / constructed / made /

---

[a] *mu bzhi*.
[b] *bon*.
[c] *gzhi*.
[d] *ma skyes pa*.
[e] *ma skyes pa*.
[f] *'dus ma byas*.
[g] *skyes pa*.
[h] *skyes pa*.

contrived / fabricated (Pali, *sankhata*; Skt. *samskrita*; Tib. düjai[a])—and, insofar as intentional, self-conscious action (which is what we refer to by the word "action," to which we are constrained while in *samsara*) asserts the core of human delusion and hence of fragmentation, production and conditioning, which is the subject-object duality, whatever action we may undertake as a means to achieve the unconcealment of the unfragmented, unborn, uncaused, unmade, unconditioned, nature will sustain the veil of fragmentation and conditioning that conceals it.

As we have seen, Heraclitus used the term *lethe* to refer to the concealment of this single, true, unconditioned and unthinkable nature of everything; conversely, he used the name *aletheia* to refer to its non-concealment—and hence this term must be a synonym of *nirvana*, *bodhi* and so on. However, in spite of the fact that the senses of *lethe* and *aletheia* are very clear in the extant fragments, the two main interpretations of Heraclitus' *lethe* and *aletheia* that Heidegger produced—the one that he laid out in 1927 in § 44 b of *Being and Time (Sein und Zeit)*, and the one he expounded in 1943 in the text called "Aletheia"[b]—failed to capture the meanings Heraclitus gave the Greek terms. Let us begin by showing why this is so, in order to subsequently proceed to demonstrate that Heidegger would have been quite wrong if it were true that—as Reinhard May has suggested[c]—he believed he was saying the same as Ch'an or Zen Buddhism, while *concealing* this source of inspiration of this thought.

In *Being and Time*, Heidegger understood Heraclitus' *aletheia* in two different senses: (1) Primarily and originally, *aletheia* corresponded to what the author referred to as the "open(ing)"[d] of the *Dasein* (i.e. of the being of the human essent as such, which was fully "discoverer of being"). (2) In a secondary, less original sense, *aletheia* corresponded to the "uncover(ing)"[e] of essents, which consisted in the purest patency of intramundane essents,[f] and which could take place only when the *Dasein* was in the condition Heidegger called its "open(ing)." Concerning (1), which Heidegger discussed in § 44 b of the book in question, there can be no doubt that he ignored the "temporal distance" that later on his disciple, H. G. Gadamer,[198] insisted should be respected in the hermeneutics of ancient texts, for he interpreted Heraclitus' use of the term *aletheia* as though the Ephesian, rather than being a cosmological philosopher (and in my view a non-dual mystic), had been a twentieth century representative of *Existenzphilosophie*.[199] The German thinker who ardently worked for the Nazis[200] identified what he called "the *Dasein*'s open(ing)" with what he named *being-toward-death*, which he explained in terms of three theses,[201] but which implied *Angst* insofar as it was in *Angst* that the state of thrownness[g]-in-death was uncovered most originally and peremptorily (a notion that was characteristic of nineteen-twentieth century European *Existenzphilosophie* and existentialism).[202] At any rate, as a Spanish interpreter of Western philosophy and Eastern thought has noted,[h] the fact that the *Dasein* is *being-toward-death* means that it corresponds to human existence that experiences itself as temporary and finite: as limited in time by birth and death, and as

[a] *'dus byas*.
[b] Heidegger (1943).
[c] May (1996).
[d] German, *offen*; *öffnen*.
[e] German, *entdecken*; *Entdeckung*.
[f] Heidegger (1996), § 44 a & b, pp. 198-201 & 201-208 (original German Ed. pp. 214-219 & 219-226).
[g] German, *Geworfenheit*. "Thrown:" German, *Geworfen*.
[h] Pániker (1992), pp. 15-6.

limited in space by the boundaries of the organism. Therefore, there can be no doubt that it is a most essential manifestation of basic human delusion.

Fragment 123 DK of Heraclitus tells us that the *physis*—the unconditioned Totality of nature and the true condition of all the essents that manifest in our conditioned experience—"likes to hide (*kruptesthai*)." If what hides in the concealment that Heraclitus called *lethe* is the *physis*, then *aletheia*—the "unveiling of the true"—must necessarily consist in the patency of the *physis*[203] that, being the true condition of all essents, could not be limited in time by birth and death, or be limited in space by the organism's boundaries. In fact, Fr. 50 DK tells us that those who listen, not to the 'I', but to the *logos* (another name for the *physis*, which Heraclitus used when he intended to emphasize its Gnitive or spiritual aspect),[204] wisely acknowledge that all is one:[205] the illusion of separate existence in space and time that the *Dasein* or human existent is (and therefore the multiplicity of such existents), as well as the seeming multiplicity of *Seiende* (a term which as used here refers to the nonhuman essents that appear solely as object[206]), are conditioned, fragmentary, illusory phenomena which arise as a result of the manifestation of the second and third senses the terms *avidya* and marigpa[a] have in the threefold classification chosen here, and which conceal the unconditioned, unfragmented *physis*, causing us to perceive the unconditioned and unfragmented as being conditioned and fragmented. Together with the basic unawareness that corresponds to the first of the meanings the terms *avidya* and marigpa have in the threefold classification chosen here (i.e. the contingent, beclouding element of stupefaction [mongcha[b]] that conceals the true nature of the Base, obscuring primordial, Awake, nondual self-awareness, so that its own face cannot become patent), *avidya* or marigpa in the second and third senses the terms have in the threefold classification chosen here make up the veil that must fall in *aletheia*. Therefore, Heidegger's interpretation of *aletheia* as consisting in the patency of the conditioned and fragmented state *being-toward-death* is, must be rejected as most unreasonable. (Though at this point Heraclitus asserted all to be one, as shown above, the fact that throughout his book again and again he made contradictory assertions with regard to the nature of reality [and also the fact that he repeatedly demonstrated that the opposites are interdependent and that they are abstracted out of a continuum] shows that he was perfectly aware that no concept, including that of oneness, could correspond to the true nature of reality.)

As expressed in Fr. 2 DK, though the *logos* is common, each individual believes he or she has a separate, particular and private intellect: the awareness and intelligence of each and every individual, rather than being functions of an inherently separate, autonomous psyche, in truth are functions of the (universal) *logos* that constitutes the Gnitive (or "spiritual") aspect of the *physis* and that, being common to all, could not be limited in space and time—the illusory, apparently separate intellect that is the nucleus of the *Dasein* thus (being) but a false appearance that deluded humans mistakenly take for the core of their selves, and, in many cases, believe to be an "immortal" soul.[207] In turn, Fr. 89 DK tells us that, though for the Awake Ones there is one single and common world, each and every one of the asleep ones goes astray toward his or her particular [dream-]world: these "particular [dream-]worlds" are the conditioned, fragmented products of the delusory valuation of thought, and as such they imply the concealment (*lete*) of the unconditioned and unfragmented *physis* / *logos* that we all (are) in truth. Thus *aletheia* consists in

---

[a] *ma rig pa*.
[b] *rmongs cha*.

Awakening from the "dream" (so to say) of apparently absolute separateness and multiplicity that has as its core the human individual's illusion of being a *Dasein* limited in space and time.

In the text "Aletheia," written in 1943 and therefore long after the beginning of the *Kehre* or "turnabout"[208] (and at a time at which, as we have seen, he had already received crucial Eastern influences), Heidegger offered an interpretation of *aletheia* that, at first sight, may seem far sounder than the one he laid out in *Being and Time*.[209] He cites the Diels-Kranz version of Fr. B 16 DK of Heraclitus' book, which I will adapt as follows: "How can one *hide* before that which does not set."[210] Heidegger understood that what did not set was the *physis*, which he characterized in a seemingly correct way when he stated that it is "something that originally imparts their nature both to the object and its objectivity, and to the subject and its subjectivity, and which therefore is previous to the realm of their reciprocity." The point is that, since the *physis* "likes to *hide*" (Fr. B 123 DK), and since the cosmic time cycle (*aion* [Skt. *kalpa*])[211] is the checkers-playing child to whom [real] kingship belongs (Fr. B 52 DK),[a][212] the *physis qua aion* playfully gives rise to the illusory subject-object duality, which, even though the *physis* does not set, goes along with the manifestation of the illusion of a limited human consciousness to which the *physis* illusorily sets insofar as this consciousness involves a limited and hermetic focus of attention that ignores the *physis* as such and "dreams" the experience of apparently substantial multiplicity—so that the *physis seemingly* sets with regard to it.

In a later period of his thinking, Heidegger wrote with regard to fragment B 52 DK:[b] "The play has no 'why'. The play plays by playing. It keeps being a mere play: the highest and most profound. But this 'mere' is all, the One, the Unique." Concerning these words, R. Ohashi, who believed they attested to the correspondence between Heidegger's philosophy and Eastern thought, wrote:[c] "The 'play', not only in Chuang-tzu, but also in Lao-tzu and especially in Buddhism, is the mode of being of the supreme nature and freedom. For Asian thought it is the highest expression."[213] However, if at this later stage Heidegger was writing under the influence of his Eastern sources, there can be no doubt that he failed to understand them correctly, for he went on to say: "There remains the question as to whether and how we, upon listening to the phases of this play, the beats of this musical composition,[214] are able to participate in the play by introducing ourselves in it."[d] Heidegger's misunderstanding lies in the fact that, in order to introduce ourselves in the play, we would have to be outside the play, but we have never been outside it: all that happens and all that is, occurs as the "play" of the single universal principle, and therefore ourselves and all that we take to be our actions have always (been) part of this play. However, the *physis* "likes to *hide*:" the core of this play has been compared to a game of hide-and-seek whereby, in each individual consciousness and as each individual consciousness, the common *logos* believes itself to be a separate, particular, autonomous soul or mind—as a result of which there arises our delusory experience of the play as not being a play, of ourselves as being separate from all other spontaneous movements of the play, and of our actions as being done by a separate, particular, private and autonomous soul or mind rather than spontaneously issuing from the single universal principle and

---

[a] Heidegger (1997), p. 169 (conclusive passage). Referred to in Saviani (2004), n. 37, p. 37.
[b] Heidegger (1997), p. 169 (conclusive passage). Referred to in Saviani (2004), n. 37, p. 37.
[c] Ohashi (1989), p. 139.
[d] Heidegger (1997), p. 169 (conclusive passage). Referred to in Saviani (2004), n. 37, p. 37.

(being) this principle.[215] Therefore, the point is not whether or not we can participate in the play by "introducing ourselves in it," but whether or not our delusory experience of our "selves" and actions as being external to the play may be eradicated.

It would be extremely naïve to believe that such a subtle thought as Heraclitus' could posit as the *arche* one of the (4 or 5) elements, for the principle of all elements, of being and nonbeing, and of all human and nonhuman essents, logically has to be wider and more comprehensive than each of the essents and than each of the elements of which it is the principle.[216] Thus, there can be no doubt that the fire (*pyr*) that Heraclitus posited as the *arche* must be interpreted metaphorically. Since of all elements fire is the one that most clearly illustrates the unceasing change of the *physis* that he emphasized with his renowned expression *panta rhei* (everything flows), it has been interpreted as a metaphor for this unceasing change. Likewise, fire may be a symbol for the energy that (according to Wisdom traditions that I deem linked with Heraclitus, and according to the physics of our time as well) is the basic constituent of all essents.[217] Heraclitus may have had the two first interpretations in mind when he identified the *arche* with fire, and *it is not altogether impossible* that he *also* may have had in mind the interpretation of Heraclitus' fire or *pyr* Heidegger made in "Aletheia," for light is a symbol for and a manifestation of energy. The point is that, according to the latter interpretation, fire or *pyr* corresponded to an acceptation of the German term *Lichtung*, which in this context has been associated to the concept of "dawn" or "aurora" and has been translated into English as "Lighting"—but which, in the context in question, I prefer to render freely as "clarity-luminosity" (and which, thus understood, would be remindful of the luminosity widely referred to in Buddhist Tantrism and Dzogchen, of which the best known example might perhaps be its shining forth in the "after-death" as described in the so-called *Tibetan Book of the Dead*—a text which was available in German at the time Heidegger produced this interpretation).[a] [218] At any rate, there can be no doubt that the *arche* constitutes the "essential plenitude of sameness" and that in itself it is beyond the subject-object duality; it may be added that it couldn't be altered either by its occultation or veiling, or by its unveiling.[219]

Since, as we have seen, Heidegger declared that if he had understood D. T. Suzuki's works on Zen Buddhism correctly, what Suzuki was saying was precisely what he had been trying to say throughout his writings (unfortunately, as I show here, the German thinker understood Suzuki incorrectly), some people may come to believe that, in "Aletheia," and in general at some point in the process of *Kehre* or "turnabout," Heidegger came to view Heraclitus' *aletheia* as being the same as what Buddhists call Awakening[b]. However, the German writer's phenomenology was based on his samsaric experience; as we have seen, since in *Being and Time* it was "the *Dasein*'s open(ing)"—corresponding to what in that book was referred to as *being-toward-death* (which, as already noted, is human existence experiencing itself as temporary and finite)—that he viewed primarily as the greatest possible degree of truth, authenticity and openness, it is clear that the experience to which that notorious work responded was marked by delusion and pertained to *samsara*. Despite the fact that in the final period of Heidegger's thinking he had absorbed many of the views of Taoism and Buddhism, we have seen that at a very late stage of his thinking he misunderstood the concept of human life and experience as the play of the single principle, and below it will be shown that he continued to misunderstand the nature of the *arche*. At

[a] Padmasambhava according to Karma Lingpa (1938).
[b] Pali, *bodhi*; Skt. *bodhi*; Tib. changchub (*byang chub*); Chin. *p'u-t'i*; Jpn. *bodai*.

any rate, an Awake individual would never have worked for the Nazis, urged the students of his University to follow Hitler in his bellicose, genocidal madness, worn a Nazi swastika at a conference on philosophy, or snubbed an old acquaintance because of his Jewish roots.[220] Thus it is clear that the experience to which the writings of the latest period of Heidegger's thought responded was equally marked by delusion and as such pertained to *samsara*.[221]

In fact, what in this period Heidegger posited as the greatest possible degree of truth, authenticity and openness was his own understanding of Heraclitus' *aletheia*, which, as we have seen, at first sight may seem to correspond to the unveiling of the *physis-logos*, but which Heidegger explained as the unconcealment of *being* (*das Sein*). Heidegger made the mistake of identifying *being* with what he believed was Heraclitus' conception of the *logos* because, as we have seen, he *correctly* understood that being had what he called an "appellative force," and he *incorrectly* understood Heraclitus' *logos* as being associated with the word and the act of saying[222]—thus giving it a meaning which was somehow related to the one Aristotle and other later thinkers gave it, but which was in direct contradiction with the earlier meaning Heraclitus had given it (and even with the one the Stoics gave it in the belief that they were following Heraclitus).[223] In fact, as we have repeatedly seen, Heraclitus' usage of the term *logos* has very little to do with the word or with the act of saying, for it was but another name for the *physis*, employed in order to place the emphasis on the intelligence inherent in it, or on what we may view as its mental or spiritual aspect. Therefore, thus understood, the *logos* is neither a concept involving a *differentia specifica* (as is the case with the concept of being, which as we have seen has its *differentia specifica* in nonbeing[224]), nor a delusive phenomenon (like the one that manifests when we hear, pronounce, think of imply with our thinking the word "being," which I have shown to be the result of the delusory valuation of the concept of being), nor the disclosure of an essent's being (as in the case of the farmer's shoes in a picture by Van Gogh discussed below). The *logos* as Heraclitus understood the term—this cannot be repeated too often—is the awareness / intelligence aspect of the true condition of reality, which, being free of limits, cannot be made to fit within the limits inherent in concepts, and which unveils in *aletheia*: the non-concealment that is the greatest possible degree of truth, authenticity and openness.

But did Heidegger, in his last period, continue to identify Heraclitus' *aletheia* with (1) what the author referred to as the "open(ing)" of the *Dasein* or the being of the human essent as such, which as we have seen was fully "discoverer of being," and (2) what he called the "uncover(ing)"[a] of *being* (*das Sein*), understood as the fullest, purest patency of intramundane essents? In the text *The Origin of the Work of Art*, written in 1936 and hence decidedly posterior to the beginning of the *Kehre*, taking as an example Van Gogh's representation of a farmer's shoes, Heidegger said that, while contact with the shoes themselves did not give us the truth of the shoes, the picture made patent what those utensils were *qua* utensils, and asserted that it was this supposed state of unconcealment of the being of essents that the Greeks called *aletheia*.[b] Furthermore, toward the end of the same work, he stated: "Truth is the unconcealedness of that which is as something that is. Truth is the truth of being."[c] Though it is certain that the greatest possible degree of truth,

---

[a] German, *entdecken*; *Entdeckung*.
[b] Heidegger (1971), pp. 32-36.
[c] Heidegger (1971), p. 39.

authenticity and openness lies in *aletheia* as understood by the Ephesian philosopher, this is so precisely because what he called *aletheia* did *not* lie in the unconcealment of the being of each particular available essent *qua* available essent different from all other available essents, but in the unconcealment of the true condition of *all* essents—which, as noted by Madhyamika philosophy, is beyond being and nonbeing: as we have seen repeatedly, what unconceals itself in *aletheia* is what Heraclitus called *physis-physis*, what Taoism called *tao*, what Buddhism called absolute condition, Buddha-nature, thatness or *dharmata*, what the Dzogchen teachings call *bodhichitta*, thigle chenpo[a], the Base and so on—and which has been referred to by so many other names but which, being unthinkable (Skt. *achintya*), no name or concept can properly render it. It is *solely when understood in the manner of Heraclitus* that we may validly assert *aletheia* to correspond to the greatest possible degree of truth, authenticity and openness, in the sense these terms have in Buddhism.

Furthermore, if we think that in later works Heidegger abandoned this concept of *aletheia* we are wrong, for we find it again and again; for example, in the 1953 work *Einfüruhng in die Metaphysik*, he stated, "Insofar as being *is*, as such, it puts itself and is in the state of unconcealment, *aletheia*... The Greek essence of truth is only possible in union with the Greek essence of being, understood *qua physis*. Based on the peculiar essential connection of *physis* with *aletheia* the Greeks could say: *the essent is*, qua *essent*, *true*. The true as such is [in the process of] being."[b] This is the absolute inversion of the way things are and of the Taoist and higher Buddhist interpretation of reality, for, as we have seen, essents arise as a function of basic human delusion, and the *aletheia* or non-concealment of the *physis* shows that no *essent* was ever true, that no essent ever had the slightest measure of self-being. Heidegger went on: "To be *essent* implies: to present itself, to appear manifesting, to offer itself, to expose something."[c] Thus it is clear that at no point did Heidegger go beyond the identification of *aletheia* with being, which in his last period he understood in quite ambiguous terms: just while viewing being as prior to the subject-object duality, in the nineteen fifties he continued to identify it with presence, which, as he himself made it explicit, implies the duality in question, for he repeatedly wrote the term as pre-sence[225] and explained it as having the Platonic etymological sense of "being before" (i.e. "being in front of).[d] We find quite a few examples of the identification of being with presence (*Anwesenheit*; *Praesenz*) in *Einführung in Die Metaphysik* (1953), in Zur Seinsfrage (1955)[226] and in several others of his late works. For example, in Zur Seinsfrage he wrote:[e]

> Being means, from the early Greek to the last period of our century: presence.

Elsewhere in the same book, again he spelled the term as "pre-sence."[f] Then, in the final pages of the same work, he wrote the term "being" crossed out, and noted that

[a] *thig le chen po*.
[b] Heidegger (1987). Since at the moment of writing this, the English version was no longer available to me, I translated from Heidegger (1980), pp. 139-140.
[c] Heidegger (1987). Since at the moment of writing this, the English version was no longer available to me, I translated from Heidegger (1980), p. 140.
[d] Heidegger (1987).
[e] Heidegger (1955), p. 400.
[f] E.g. Heidegger (1955), pp. 408, 419.

nothingness should also be thought of in this way.[a] Though this may cause some readers of this book to believe that he realized being to be untrue, and though the fact that he noted that nothingness should be thought of in the same way may lead some to believe he realized that nothingness was also untrue,[b] Heidegger's point was that in his view the word being presupposes that anything can be, and since language exists precisely insofar as it presupposes this possibility, it is extremely difficult to put into question and examine this presupposition: he crossed out the term in order to make it easier for us to do this. He wrote:[c]

> ...the question regarding the essence of being becomes extinguished if the language of metaphysics is not abandoned, for metaphysical representing prevents thinking the question for the essence of being.

At no point did Heidegger hint in any way that the *phenomenon of being* was delusive—or, even less so, that it was the most basic delusive phenomenon, at the root of all delusion. On the contrary, in *Einführung in die Metaphysik* (1953) he let us see he was outraged and scandalized because Nietzsche had asserted being to be no more than vapor and error, and then went on to ask whether being is a mere word and its meaning vapor and error, as Nietzsche believed, or whether it constitutes *the spiritual destiny of the West*.[d] Then in Zur Seinsfrage (1955) he asked whether being is something in itself, whether it "gives itself" to human beings, and whether it does so often, and the reply was in the affirmative: then he went on into a discussion of how being "gives itself."[227] Heidegger then noted that subjectivity and objectivity are founded in a peculiar opening of being and of the human essence, which stabilizes [the act of] representing in the distinction of the two *qua* subject and object, and that this makes a position of being which wants to name being while taking into account the subject-object distinction, and which does not meditate what already remains unthought in what is problematic.[e] However, this does not at all mean that being, insofar as it (is) previous to the subject-object distinction, is the same as the Tao, the *physis*, the *logos*, the Buddha-nature, the true nature of all entities (Skt. *dharmata*; Tib. *chönyi*[f]), etc. for, as we have seen repeatedly, what all these names refer to is the unthinkable and unnamable, whereas Heidegger's being lies in language, is something that is thought, and possesses what he called an "appellative force."

Some have believed Heidegger was expressing an Eastern (Taoist or Buddhist) understanding of reality by coining terms such as *das Nichts nichtet*, and by changing the noun form of many terms into verb-processes, in such a way that *Sein* became *seyn*, *Welt* became *welten*, *Zeit* became *zeitigen* and *zeiten*, *Ding* became *dingen*, *Raum* became *räumen*, *Spiel* became *spielen*, *Sprache* became *sprechen*, *Stille* became *stillen*, and *Ereignis* became *ereignen*: in the view of these interpreters, Heidegger did this in an attempt to "turn [what these terms convey] into unpredicable originary activities of a happening without subject and object" that could only be expressed in tautological terms (the *thing things*, the *world worlds*, etc). However, by so doing Heidegger may have been

[a] Heidegger (1955), p. 411.
[b] Heidegger (1955), p. 411 *et seq*.
[c] Heidegger (1955), p. 405. Author's translation of the excerpt.
[d] Heidegger (1987). Also in Heidegger, Martin, Spanish, 1980, pp. 73-75.
[e] Heidegger (1955), p. 408.
[f] *chos nyid*.

simply following the blueprint of the Chinese languages, in which what we view as substantive and substantial essents is expressed as processes—which has been taken to imply that the Chinese do not view them as being sub-stances. (It seems less likely that he may have been aware of terms such as the Sanskrit *swayambhu* and the Tibetan rangjung[a], and other Dzogchen and Tantric Buddhist terms that do roughly the same, for at the time these were little known in Germany and other Western countries.) At any rate, this does not in any way imply the destruction of the delusive identity between being and truth, or the idea that being lies in language, and all that has been already discussed.

In fact, as demonstrated above, the late Heidegger made *aletheia* and Truth lie in *being*, contradicting both Buddhism (and in particular the Mahayana and higher forms of Buddhism) and Heraclitus' thinking. Had Heraclitus understood the *logos* as Heidegger did—as consisting in *being* and as such being reducible to a concept having a *differentia specifica*, as being associated to the word and the act of saying, and as having an appellative force (so that, as we have seen, simply listening, pronouncing or thinking the term "being" gives rise to the most general and ubiquitous of all delusive phenomena)—the Ephesian would not have made all of the assertions considered in this chapter ("those who listen, not to the 'I', but to the *logos*, wisely acknowledge that all is one," "the *logos* likes to hide," "though the *logos* is common, each human being believes he or she has a separate, particular and private intellect") while at the same time referring to the true condition of reality by juxtaposing mutually contradictory terms. Therefore, there can be no doubt that what Heraclitus called *logos* is precisely what cannot be expressed by words or by any act of saying, for insofar as it has neither *genus proximum* nor *differentia specifica* it must be characterized as ineffable and unthinkable. This shows that, if, as everything suggests, Heidegger was really thinking under the influence of Taoism, Zen Buddhism and so on, he failed to assimilate these systems properly; that he never had any of the realizations of Buddhism or Taoism, and that he never produced a system of thought that may be considered analogous to any Eastern system.[228] And yet, curiously enough, Heidegger does not seem to have been oblivious to the fact that Buddhism sought a liberation of being through the realization of voidness, or that this involved surpassing the human will, for in his late period he wrote:[b]

> But, what does this redemption of the aversion to passing consist in? Does it perhaps consist in a liberation of will in general? That is, in the sense of Schopenhauer and Buddhism? To the degree to which, according to the teaching of modern metaphysics, the being of the essent is will, the liberation of will would amount to a liberation of Being, and hence to a fall into the void of Nothingness.

Here, at first sight the term "nothingness" seems to have either the sense of the Mandarin term *wu* and the Japanese *mu*, or that of the Mandarin *k'ung* and the Japanese *ku*, but "being," insofar as Heidegger tells us it must dissolve for nothingness to manifest, is not identical with this nothingness. However, what in his final period he viewed as the epitome of truth, authenticity and openness was what he called *das Ereignis* ("the Event"), in which being (*das Sein*) was identical with the *arche qua* single principle and true nature of all essents, and which some explained in terms of a circular conception of the *Dasein*'s concealment and unconcealment (*Da*), whereas others understood it as representing a

---

[a] *rang byung*.
[b] Heidegger (1954c), p. 113. Cited in Saviani (2004), p. 20. Author's translation of the excerpt.

transition from Heidegger's original conception of being to a Hegel-like conception of it.[229] The reason for the latter interpretation is that the identification of being with the *arche*—which as stated repeatedly is unthinkable insofar as it has neither *genus proximum* nor *differentia specifica*—deprives the concept of being of its essence, which depends on the contrast of being with nonbeing, and therefore divests the word "being" of what, as late as 1953, Heidegger called its "appellative force."[230] Furthermore, as will be shown in the next section of this chapter, since 1929 he began making assertions such as "nothingness belongs originarily to the essence (*Wesen*) of being itself," "the terms 'being' and 'nothingness' are used each for the other in a familiarity the essential plenitude of which we have not thought as yet," and the like—all of which *at first sight* may seem to respond to a Hegelian conception of being.

However, at no point in his evolution did Heidegger explicitly acknowledge that the identification of being with the *arche* would cause the concept of being to lose its meaning and be left with no meaning whatsoever; furthermore, despite the fact that leaving the concept of being with no meaning whatsoever would make it impossible for being to lie in language or to be thought, or for the term "being" to have what the German thinker called an "appellative force," at no point in his evolution did Heidegger retract from his assertions that being lay in language and that it had to be thought, or that the term "being" had what the German thinker called an "appellative force." And yet, as we have seen, at a late stage of his philosophical evolution he asserted the term *Ereignis* to be as difficult to translate as the Greek word *logos* and the Mandarin term Tao[a]—and although our author did not explain the reason for this, it lies precisely in the fact that *das Ereignis* corresponds to the *arche*, which, unlike the concept of being with which Heidegger identified it in the concept of *das Ereignis*, lacks *genus proximum* and *differentia specifica*.

***Das Ereignis*, the Hegelian Identity of Being and Nothingness, and the Eastern Concepts "Nothingness" and "Voidness"**

In the revised version of the *Logic* that appeared in Hegel's *Encyclopedia*,[b] dialectic develops from being *qua* the most inadequate and abstract, to the absolute Idea as the most adequate and concrete. This explains the reason why, at the beginning of the *Science of Logic*,[c] Hegel had stated that being has been [always] identical with nothingness: insofar as Hegel viewed being as the *most abstract and indeterminate* of concepts, he identified it with the negation of determinations embodied in the equally abstract and indeterminate concept of nothingness. However, this identification has also been related to Hegel's premise, which will be briefly discussed in Part III of this book, that nature, the external world, society and all that thought and language interpret is Spirit (*Geist*, which in order to avoid religious interpretations is in general rendered as Mind), the Idea (in the *Encyclopedia*,[d] sec. 248, Hegel says that "Nature has come to pass as the Idea in the form of otherness") or Reason[231] (which is the term he used in the *Introduction to the Philosophy of History*)[e] appearing as external to it. This implies that all that we deem to be external to

[a] Heidegger (1957), p. 125. Cited in Saviani (2004), p. 20. Author's translation of the excerpt.
[b] Hegel (1991).
[c] Hegel (1990).
[d] Hegel (1991).
[e] Hegel (1988).

our mind and that we interpret in terms of concepts, is indistinguishable from the concepts in terms of which we interpret it, and as such must correspond exactly to these concepts; however, for this correspondence to obtain, it is necessary to describe reality in terms of contradictions, for in Hegel's view reality is contradictory (for example, for an entity to move, it would have to simultaneously be and not be in the same place).[232] However, Hegel's claim that being and nothingness are identical obliterates the *differentia specifica* that determines the concept of being, so that on the logical plane it voids this concept of any content whatsoever, turning it into an empty, indeterminate, false concept, and on the phenomenological plane it causes it not to correspond to anything that may manifest in our experience—so that it cannot have what Heidegger called an "appellative force." In fact, if Hegel's conception of *being* were correct, the delusory valuation of this concept would not give rise to the *phenomenon of being*, for the delusory valuation of an empty concept cannot give rise to any phenomenon. Therefore, Hegel's concept of *being* does not correspond to the concept of being we human beings share.

As noted at the end of the preceding section, the fact that in the concept of *das Ereignis* Heidegger identified being with the *arche*, which has neither *genus proximum* nor *differentia specifica*, has the same effect as Hegel's identification of being with nothingness: it deprives being of its *differentia specifica*, which lies in its contrast with nonbeing. Furthermore, as we have seen, from 1929 Heidegger began making assertions that seemed to define being as being identical with nothingness and which therefore some interpreted as responding to a transformation of his concept of being that caused it to become identical or analogous to the Hegelian conception of being expressed at the beginning of the *Science of Logic*. Were this interpretation correct, Heidegger's late concept of being would be liable to the objection Sartre raised with regard to Hegel's concept of being:[a]

> To oppose being to nothingness as a thesis to its antithesis, in the style of Hegel's understanding, would amount to assuming a logical simultaneity between them. Thus two contraries arise at the same time as the two limit-terms of a logical series. But here we must keep in mind that only the opposites can enjoy this simultaneity, insofar as they are equally positive (or equally negative). However, nonbeing is not the opposite of being; it is its contradictory. This implies a logical posteriority of nothingness with regard to being, insofar as it is being first posited and then denied. Therefore being and nonbeing cannot be concepts with the same content; contrariwise, nonbeing supposes an irreducible step of the mind: no matter what the primitive undifferentiation of being may be, nonbeing is this same undifferentiation *negated*. What allows Hegel to 'make being pass' into nothingness, is that he has implicitly introduced negation in his very definition of being. This is self-evident insofar as a definition is negative, for Hegel has told us, in terms of Spinoza's dictum, that *omnis determinatio est negatio*. And doesn't he write: 'No matter what determination or content would distinguish being from something else, positing a content in it, it would not allow to keep it in its purity. It is pure indetermination and voidness. *Nothing* can be apprehended in it'. Thus, it is Hegel himself who has introduced in being from behind this negation that he will find again when he makes it pass into nonbeing. It is just that here there is a play upon words concerning the very notion of negation. For if I negate in being all determinations and all contents, by so doing I am asserting that it *is*. Thus, if we negate in being all that we may wish, due to the very fact that we are negating that it is this or that [and thereby we are affirming it as *being*], we could not make it *not be*. The negation could

[a] Sartre (1980), pp. 50-1.

> not attain the nucleus-of-being of the being that is absolute plenitude and total positiveness. Contrariwise, nonbeing is a negation that concerns (i.e. is aimed at) this very nucleus of density of fullness. It is at its very heart that nonbeing is negated. When Hegel writes (P. c. 2 ed. E. § LXXXVII) '[Being and nothingness] are void abstractions and each of them is as void as the other', he forgets that voidness is voidness *of* something (an error that is even more strange insofar as Hegel was the first to have noted that 'every negation is a determined negation'—that is, has a content). Now, being is empty *of* every determination except for the identity with itself; however, nonbeing is empty of being (rather than being empty merely of the *determinations of* being)…
>
> "Thus, when even being would not be the support of any differentiated quality, nothingness would be logically posterior to it insofar as, in order to negate it, it [pre]supposes being—because the irreducible quality of the *non-* comes to add itself to this undifferentiated mass of being in order to free it. This does not only mean that we must refuse to place on the same plane *being* and *nonbeing*, but also that we must beware of never positing nothingness as an original abyss out of which being would arise. …"[233]

Sartre is right in his claim that nonbeing is logically posterior to being insofar as nonbeing is the result of a negation by secondary process on the basis of the previously manifest concept and phenomenon of being (Heidegger would not admit this assertion with regard to his concept of *nichtendes Nichts*, which will be discussed below and which in his view is prior to negation and is the basis of the very possibility of negation; here, however, we are discussing a different concept and hence we cannot permit ourselves to make a detour and move into the evaluation of Heidegger's *nichtendes Nichts*). Sartre is also right in that no matter what the primitive undifferentiation of being may be, nonbeing is this same undifferentiation *negated* and as such nothingness, understood as nonbeing, could by no means be the same as being.

However, the term "nothingness" can also be understood etymologically in the sense of no-thing-ness, which thus spelled refers to the quality of "not being a thing" or "not being an essent," and therefore may be applied both to being *qua* the illusion of self-being, and to the *physis-logos,* Dzogchen *qua* Base, and so on. In fact, the term may be applied to being *qua* the illusion of self-being insofar as the *phenomenon of being* at the root of this illusion is not a thing or an essent, but the non-concrete and non-discrete phenomenon that makes essents appear to have self-being. And it may be applied to the *physis*, to Dzogchen *qua* Base, and so on, insofar as what these terms refer to, rather than being an essent, (is) the source and true nature or condition of all essents. As shown in Chapter I, the Dzogchen teachings illustrate the Base with the simile of a mirror that can reflect any appearance precisely because its essence or ngowo[a] aspect is no-thing-ness (in a sense directly related to that of the Mandarin term *wu* and the Japanese term *mu*): it is the lack of fixed appearances characteristic of the reflective side of a mirror that, given the mirror's brightness (in the sense of its capacity to reflect light and the images that light impresses upon the eye), allows the mirror to "fill itself" with countless sorts of forms and colors. However, even when the mirror is filled with images, it continues to be no-thing-ness, for what is reflected has the same nothingness nature as the mirror and, insofar as reflections in a mirror are insubstantial and depend on the mirror and on all other reflections to manifest, they do not have self-being—which is what general Madhyamika philosophy calls "emptiness of self-being" (Skt. *swabhava-shunyata*; Tib. rangzhinggyi

[a] *ngo bo*.

tongpanyi[a]; Mandarin, *k'ung*; Jap. *ku*) and posits with regard to all essents.[234] (As noted in the preceding chapter, the fact that all phenomena [are] in truth the *physis*, Dzogchen *qua* Base or however we call the unthinkable and unnamable, so that no phenomenon has / is a nature different from the single true nature of all essents, is what the Inner, Subtle Madhyamika [Tib. Nang Trawai Uma[b]] associates to the term zhengyi ngöpo tongpanyi[c], rendered as "emptiness of other substances" or "emptiness of extraneous substances," which makes the point that there is nothing extraneous to the single, true nature of reality: according to this type of Madhyamaka, the true nature of reality is empty in the zhentong sense *insofar as* phenomena are void in the rangtong sense, and phenomena are empty in the rangtong sense *insofar as* the true nature of reality is void in the zhentong sense and *insofar as* they depend on other phenomena.[235]) However, even though being, on the one hand, and the *physis* / Base / etc. on the other, have in common the fact that they are no-thing-ness, as indisputably shown above, they are *not at all* one and the same.

Some of those who insist that the thought of the late Heidegger was influenced by Taoism and Ch'an/Zen Buddhism, have tried to prove that his conception of nothingness was determined by his discovery of the Taoist and Ch'an / Zen Buddhist notion expressed by the Mandarin term *wu* and the Japanese term *mu*. In order to determine whether this may or may not be so, and whether or not Heidegger's late concept of being may or may not correspond to Hegel's being-that-is-identical-with-nothingness, we must analyze the distinction between the two different types of *Nichts* or nothingness that Heidegger introduced in his late works, beginning in *Was ist Metaphysik?* The first of these types of nothingness is the one he called *nichtiges Nichts*, which I will render as 'nil nothingness', and which corresponds to the Western metaphysical concept of nonbeing *qua* lack of manifestation (in Christian terms, to the nothingness that prevailed before the creation of the world; in Platonic terms, to the formless matter the Demiurge infused with form; in Dzogchen terms, to the lack of the phenomena of the thukje[d] aspect of the Base).[236] Thus understood, nothingness could not correspond to the concept expressed by the terms *wu* and *mu*, insofar as these terms do not imply lack of manifestation;[237] likewise, it could not be identical with being, as it was supposed to be for Hegel, for the latter coexists with being in the manifested and is indistinguishable from being.

The second type of nothingness Heidegger distinguished is the one he called *nichtendes Nichts*, a term which may be rendered as *nihilating no-thing-ness* and which, insofar as it is supposed to have a nihilating function, has been viewed as an active no-thing-ness. It is this nothingness that, according to Heidegger, coexists with being and belongs to the essence of being itself, for it is thought in its belonging together with being (provided that being be re-thought *epekeina tes usias*, "beyond substantial being"[e]); likewise, it is this nothingness that, according to our philosopher, is previous to logical-grammatical negation, for it is supposed to be the phenomenal root and the condition of possibility of this type of negation. Since it is also this type of nothingness that has been interpreted as resulting from Heidegger's assimilation of the concept of nothingness qua *wu* or *mu*, it is the one that must be compared with the concept in question.[238]

---

[a] *rang bzhing gyis stong pa nyid*.
[b] *nang phra ba'i dbu ma*.
[c] *gzhan gyi dngos po stong pa nyid*; Skt. *paravastushunyata*?
[d] *thugs rje*.
[e] Cf. Saviani (2004), pp. 42-44.

Independently of the degree to which the concept of *wu* / *mu* may have impressed Heidegger, or of whether or not he believed his *nichtendes Nichts* or nihilating no-thing-ness to be the same as *wu* / *mu*, the truth is that the two concepts could hardly be more different from each other. In fact, in *Was ist Metaphysik* our author made it clear that what he called *nichtendes Nichts* is the so-called "nothingness" that results from what Heidegger interpreted as a nihilation of the essent *qua* totality, and which he deemed responsible for this nihilation, but which basically consists in the fact that, while we are absorbed in the most fundamental and originary experience of anguish (which Heidegger mistakenly asserted to be beyond the subject-object duality, and which he contrasted with anguish in face of a definite situation), we become indifferent, oblivious and somehow unconscious regarding all that is not the experience of anguish, and in particular to the so-called "external world." He wrote:[a]

> Anguish is something fundamentally different from fear. Fear is always fear in face of this or that definite essent which threatens us from this or that definite perspective. Fear of... if always fear in face of something definite. (...) Anguish, [however, is not like fear in this regard]. (...) It is true that anguish is always anguish in face of... but not in face of this or that. Anguish in face of... is always anguish because of something, but not because of this or that. However, the indetermination of that in face of which and that because of which we anguish is not a lack of determination, but *the essential impossibility of determinability*. This is what becomes apparent in the following interpretation, well known to all.
>
> We say that in anguish "one feels uncanny (*unheimlich*)." (...) We cannot say in face of what one feels uncanny. One feels like this as a whole. All things and we ourselves sink into indifference. But this, not in the sense of a mere disappearance, but in the sense that, when they set themselves aside as such, things turn toward us. This setting itself aside of the essent in its totality, which haunts us and surrounds us in anguish, overwhelms us and oppresses us. We are left with no support. When the essent flees and vanishes, there only remains, and there only overwhelms us, that "none."
>
> Anguish reveals nothingness.
>
> "We are suspended" in anguish. More clearly stated: it is anguish that keeps us in suspense, for it is [anguish] that that causes the essent in its totality to flee. That is the reason why we ourselves—these existing human beings—flee together with the essent in the midst of the essent. And for this reason, at the bottom, [it is] not [that] "I" or "you" feel uncanny, but that "one" feels thus. Here, in the upheaval that goes through all this being suspended, in which one cannot cling to anything, only the pure being-here remains.
>
> Anguish leaves us speechless. Since the essent in its totality eludes us and this is precisely the way in which nothingness hounds us, in its presence all pretension to say something "is" is muted. That [while] submerged in the uncanniness of anguish we try to break that empty calm by means of insubstantial talk does nothing but demonstrate the presence of nothingness. That anguish unveils nothingness is something that man himself confirms as soon as the anguish disappears. In the clarity of the look produced by the still recent memory we have no choice but to say: [that] in face of which and [that] because of which one anguishes was "properly" nothing. And, in fact, nothingness proper, as such, was here.

We have repeatedly seen that the Mandarin term *wu*, used in Taoism and also in Ch'an Buddhism, when employed by itself in an ontological sense, refers to the fact that

[a] Heidegger (1929), pp. 111-112. Author's translation of the excerpt and italics.

the *physis-logos* or Dzogchen *qua* Base neither is a fixed reality nor corresponds to any concepts, and yet—just as in the case of Dzogchen *qua* Base because of its ngowo or essence aspect—it has the capacity to manifest all kinds of essents and all kinds of interpretations. We have also seen that according to general Madhyamaka philosophy all essents are void of self-being (Skt. *swabhava-shunyata*, Tib. rangzhinggyi tongpanyi[a]; Mandarin, *k'ung*, Jap. *ku*). And we have seen as well that the true nature of reality is empty of natures or substances other than itself (i.e., in the sense associated to the Skt term *parashunya* and the Tibetan term zhentong[b]). The above description of what Heidegger called *nichtendes Nichts* has made it evident that the so-called "nothingness" in question is not the same as any of these three types of emptiness or nothingness, or with any other possible Eastern conception of nothingness or emptiness.

It was in the same book that Heidegger made the above-mentioned assertion that nothingness is more fundamental and originary than 'no' and [than] negation, as well as being logically previous to it.[c] The reason for this was that in his view—which at this stage of his evolution (two years after *Being and Time* was published) was still characteristic of *Existenzphilosophie*[239]—the above-described experience, which he deemed to be an experience of nothingness involving "the nihilation of the essent *qua* totality," provided the original 'no' that founds all negation ("...the no certainly does not form itself by means of negation, but negation founds itself on the no that arises from the desisting that is nothingness"[d]). Just like Heidegger's *nichtendes Nichts*, the Mandarin term *wu*, when used by itself in an ontological sense, has little to do with negation. Since the same term, when placed before another word, acquires the meaning of the adjective "no" (as in the well-known terms *wu-wei*, *wu-hsin*, *wu-nien* and so on), one could conclude that when used by itself in an ontological sense the term refers to the phenomenal basis of logical-grammatical negation, just as, according to Heidegger, is the case with his *nichtendes Nichts*, and that this is the reason why the same word is used as a negative adjective—from which one could infer that *wu* is the same as the *nichtendes Nichts*. However, this is not the case, for, as noted above, unlike nothingness in the sense of *wu* or *mu*, unlike voidness in the rantong sense of *swabhava-shunyata*, *k'ung* and *ku*, unlike emptiness in the sense of zhengyi ngöpo tongpanyi[e], and unlike any other possible Eastern concept of emptiness or nothingness, Heidegger's *nichtendes Nichts* consists in being absorbed in a state of anguish in which, since we cannot be aware of anything but this anguish, we become indifferent, oblivious and somehow unconscious with regard to what Heidegger called the essent *qua* totality. And yet, in spite of the striking contrast between the *nichtendes Nichts* and all Eastern concept of nothingness or voidness, the following assertion by Heidegger in the Appendices to Die Zeit des Weltbildes, which refers to this *nichtendes Nichts*, has been wrongly understood as expressing an Eastern concept of nothingness or voidness:[f240]

> Nothingness is never nil, just as it is neither something in the sense of an object; it is being itself, to the truth of which man will be returned when he be surpassed *qua* subject, that is, when he ceases representing the essent as object.

---

[a] *rang bzhing gyis stong pa nyid*.
[b] *gzhan stong*.
[c] Heidegger (1929), p. 108.
[d] Heidegger (1929), pp. 116-117.
[e] *gzhan gyi dngos po stong pa nyid*; Skt. *paravastushunyata*?
[f] Heidegger (1938), p. 104. Cited in Saviani (2004), p. 45.

The reason why the above passage, which refers to Heidegger's *nichtendes Nichts* ('active no-thing-ness' or "nihilating nothingness'), which as we have seen is not the same as any Eastern concept of nothingness or voidness, has been related to Eastern concepts of nothingness or voidness, may be that in it he refers to nothingness as the Truth to which human beings will be returned when they be surpassed *qua* subjects and when they cease representing the essent as object. Since this assertion may look similar to the claim by higher forms of Buddhism that the absolute truth is initially realized when voidness becomes patent beyond all conceptuality and therefore beyond the subject-object duality, and that this realization must develop until the consolidation of Awakening, after which voidness is never lost sight of and the subject-object duality never arises again, those bent on demonstrating that Heidegger's late thinking had been influenced by Zen Buddhism and Taoism shut their eyes to the radical difference between the German thinker's *nichtendes Nichts* and Eastern conceptions of voidness or nothingness and saw the above passage as proving the identity between the one and the others. However, the fact that Heidegger identified the realization of his *nichtendes Nichts* with arriving at Truth by surpassing the subject-object duality may suggest that he himself may have wrongly believed his *nichtendes Nichts* to be the same as *some* of the Eastern conceptions of nothingness or voidness (probably the one that obtains in the realization of absolute truth in Zen Buddhism—though also the one that obtains in the realization of absolute truth in the Prasangika Madhyamaka school as understood by Chandrakirti and Shantideva is beyond the subject-object duality[241]).

Nevertheless, if Heidegger harbored the above belief, he was certainly wrong. To begin with, that there is no possible valid analogy between Heidegger's *nichtendes Nichts* and any of the Eastern conceptions of nothingness or emptiness considered so far is confirmed by the fact that Heidegger associated this type of nothingness to desisting (which has no role whatsoever in any of the Eastern conceptions in question), as involving a *Dasein* (which, furthermore, is in its state of thrownness), and as being realized in anguish (which, being an emotionally charged manifestation of the subject-object duality, could not manifest in a condition free of the duality in question). He wrote:[a]

> These possibilities of the behavior that consists in desisting—forces in which the *Dasein* stands its character of [being] thrown, though without controlling it—are not different from mere negating. But this does not prevent them to express themselves in the no and in negation.

Since in this experience there is a *Dasein*, which as we have seen is existence limited in space and time and as such is a core manifestation of basic human delusion, and since the thrownness of this *Dasein* implies that it experiences itself as different and separate from the flow of experience, it is clear that the nothingness that is thereby revealed is a manifestation of delusion occurring in *samsara*.[242] Furthermore, rather than viewing the *Dasein*—which as we have seen is at the core of delusion—as something to be eradicated, Heidegger says that all manifestations of originary anguish, whether repressed or fully experienced, have as its aim "preserving the last greatness of the *Dasein*"[b243]—

[a] Heidegger (1929), p. 117.
[b] Heidegger (1929), p. 118.

which, this seems to imply, he did *not* view as a delusive phenomenon to be overcome in the ultimate realization of emptiness that occurs when absolute truth is discovered beyond the subject-object duality. The fact that according to Heidegger fundamental or originary anguish occurred when facing *the essential impossibility of determinability*, together with the phrase "in the upheaval that goes through all this being suspended, in which one cannot cling to anything," may be taken to suggest that what Heidegger was referring to was an experience of the type I call *panic*, which as we have seen consists in uncontainable dread when facing the patency of totality and / or of the concomitant insubstantiality of essents (including the human essence itself): realization that the *Dasein* and *alles Seiende* lack self-being is dreaded as death itself, for since the individual identifies being *qua* actuality with self-being, she or he identifies realization of the *Dasein*'s lack of self-being with extinction of the *Dasein*, and views realization of the lack of self-being of *alles Seiende* as the dissolution of all of the *Dasein*'s reference points. Furthermore, insofar as derealization consists in losing one's grip on "reality," and insofar as it is associated to psychosis, in *panic* fear of death may be compounded with fear of madness. And since in general we fear the experience of fear, in *panic* fear of death and fear of madness are compounded with fear of fear.

However, although there seems to be some relationship between Heidegger's *nichtendes Nichts* and *panic qua* dread of voidness, they are *not* exactly the same thing, for *panic* occurs in derealization, which could not be what Heidegger is referring to, for in derealization dread cannot be eluded by insubstantial talk, as according to Heidegger occurs with the anguish that manifests in *nichtendes Nichts*. Likewise, as will be shown below, Heidegger's description of his *nichtendes Nichts* shows he was utterly wrong in categorizing it as being beyond the subject-object duality—and *not even* the intuition of voidness in *panic* is beyond the duality in question, for that duality is the condition of possibility of all types of fear (furthermore, on the gradual Mahayana Path the only realization of emptiness that is beyond the subject-object duality is the one that the Madhyamaka Prasangika views as the absolute truth and which marks the entrance to the third Mahayana path, which could not involve *panic* insofar as fear of voidness can no longer manifest once one has reached the third of the four levels of the second Mahayana path—which is called "forbearance of the unborn" precisely because in it practitioners completely overcome fear of emptiness).

We have seen that Heidegger asserted that the experience in which, according to him, the essent in its totality is nihilated by anguish and the *nichtendes Nichts* reveals itself, is beyond the subject-object duality. As noted above, in this regard he was utterly wrong: although the objects that initially appear in this experience might be neither discrete nor concrete, in each and every moment of fundamental or originary anguish a mental subject is taking this or that as its object. The object present just before the state occurs, and which may be thought to trigger it, may be anything that in the case of a particular individual may function as a contributory condition for an experience of this kind to be unleashed (which is why Heidegger claimed it is hardly possible to identify a trigger in such experiences; however, it is important to keep in mind that the unleashing of experiences of anguish, and in particular the auto-catalytic runaway of anguish that *may* occur in the more extreme manifestations of these experiences, ultimately depend on the structure and function of the human psyche, which has an inbuilt disposition to activate the positive feedback loops that, as shown in Part II of this book, are at the root of psychoses, spontaneous psychological self-healing processes and of the most powerful practices of the Path of Awakening).

However, as we move into the state of anguish, the nature of the object will depend on the kind of experience of anguish we face. For example, if the anguish we are experiencing is an instance of what I call *panic*, the object will be voidness and as such will be related to what Heidegger referred to by the term *essential impossibility of determinability* (although, as shown above, it will not be the same as his *nichtendes Nichts*). If it is an instance of anguish as defined by Sartre (which is directly related to the need to choose among the plethora of possibilities open before the human essent that is finite in space and time[244]), the object may be a subtle concept of incertitude that is delusorily valued-absolutized to give rise to worry. If it is the runaway of the uneasiness inherent in the illusion of separateness (in the sense of the Sanskrit term *dwesha* and the Tibetan term zhedang[a]), the object is whatever we are experiencing as irritating and are therefore driven to reject. However, no matter what sort of experience of anguish we may be undergoing, except in the brief instants in which we are switching from one object to the next, throughout the experience one or another object will be manifest to a mental subject. In fact, passions are particularly intense attitudes of a subject toward an object, associated to specially intense sensations in the center of the body at the level of the heart of the kind Buddhism calls "mental sensations" or "feeling tones" (Skt. *vedana*; Tib. tsorwa[b])—and the quality of "mental sensations" or "feeling tones" depends on the mental subject's attitude toward its object. In fact, the subject cannot have different attitudes at the same time, and the attitude it has at any given moment affects all that is not its object as well. Therefore, acceptance of the object automatically involves acceptance of the "mental sensation" or "feeling tone" we associate to that object, which thereby becomes pleasant; rejection of the object implies rejection of the "mental sensation" or "feeling tone" we associate with that object, and indifference toward the object involves indifference to the "mental sensation" or "feeling tone" we associate to that object. (And the same applies when *the object is the sensation itself*, which in this case is the "mental sensation" or "feeling tone:" just as in the examples we considered in Chapter I, acceptance makes the sensation pleasurable, rejection makes it unpleasant, and indifference makes it neutral.[245]) Since anguish is a passion, and, as just noted, passions are particularly intense attitudes of a subject toward an object, and insofar as anguish involves an unpleasant feeling tone or mental sensation, which in its turn implies that a mental subject is rejecting an object, there can be no doubt that anguish involves the subject-object duality.

Once anguish has occurred, the object will be changing from one moment to the next: one moment the object may be the insubstantiality that is the natural object of *panic* or the natural object of the variety of fundamental or originary anguish we are experiencing; another moment the object may be the conceptualization of the state of anguish, which is *not* a concrete or discrete essent; another it will be the strong mental sensation manifesting in the center of the heart (which on the one hand sustains the anguish and on the other is our mental feeling-tone of it); at another it may consist in the thought that we cannot put an end to the experience of unbearable anguish; etc. After we divert our attention from an object and before placing it on another object, the neutral state of the base-of-all (kunzhi lungmaten[c]) that is beyond the subject-object duality may manifest for an instant; however, with the exception of such instants, at each and every moment of the

[a] *zhe sdang*.
[b] *tshor ba*.
[c] *kun gzhi lung ma bstan*.

experience of fundamental, originary anguish there will be an object—and hence it is a gross error to claim that this experience is beyond the subject-object duality.

How, if the experience of anguish at each moment involves an object, and if it is a manifestation of the *Dasein*, which is human existence finite in space and time that as such necessarily involves the subject-object duality, is it possible that Heidegger may have believed that the experience of what he called *nichtendes Nichts* was beyond the duality of subject and object? The reason is, beyond doubt, that this duality never dissolved for him in an instance of *nirvana*, nor did he engage in any practice in which the duality in question had to be detected so as to take measures that may serve as a condition for its spontaneous liberation—and therefore he did not learn to recognize this duality as such when it manifests in experiences in which the object is indeterminate or abstract, rather than being a discrete and / or concrete essent.

At any rate, it has been proved beyond any doubt that Heidegger's *nichtendes Nichts* is neither the patency of no-thing-ness in the sense of the Taoist and Ch'an / Zen Buddhist concept expressed by the terms *wu* and *mu*, nor the voidness of self-existence of general Madhyamaka, nor the voidness of extraneous substances of the subtle, inner Madhyamaka. In particular, it is not the absolute voidness which simultaneously has these three senses, and which becomes patent in the third Mahayana path (or, which is the same, in the first *bodhisattva* level [Skt. *bhumi*; Tib. *sa*])[246] when the absolute truth manifests beyond conceptuality and therefore beyond the subject-object duality: when this occurs, there can be no anguish, and there is certainly no human-existence-finite-in-space-and-time (*Dasein*). If, as Heidegger's description suggests, he had in mind an experience somehow akin to *panic*, involving the compulsion to maintain the illusory separate, finite existence that the *Dasein* is, together with the "dignity" of this *Dasein*, Heidegger's *nichtendes Nichts* would certainly be an experience occurring previously to the attainment of the third stage of the second Mahayana path, for at the stage in question fear of emptiness of self-being comes to an end.[247] However, were it awareness of the primary uneasiness / irritability inherent in human-existence-finite-in-space-and-time, manifesting at a time at which we do not need to choose among the plethora of possibilities open to us, we would be dealing with the experience of *dwesha* / zhedang[a], which may continue to manifest so long as a post-Contemplation state—and with it basic human delusion—continues to occur.[248] (This experience has the leading role in higher Dzogchen practices such as those of Thögel[b] and the Yangthik[c], which create the conditions for uneasiness / irritability to arise as soon as basic human delusion manifests, immediately giving rise to a feedback runaway of anguish, and then liberating itself spontaneously together with the subject-object duality and with all conceptuality.)

Having discarded the possibility that Heidegger's *nichtendes Nichts* may be the same as any of the Eastern concepts of nothingness or voidness, it is time to ponder the possibility that in the last period of Heidegger's evolution his concept of being may have become Hegel-like (i.e. that he may have thought that the indeterminate character of the concept of being makes it be the same as nothingness—in the sense in which the term refers to indetermination and therefore is as indeterminate as that of being). Right from the beginning of the *Kehre* or "turnabout," many assertions in Heidegger's writings, if read

[a] *zhe sdang*.
[b] *thod rgal*.
[c] *yang thig*.

outside their context, may seem to suggest a Hegel-like concept of being. For example, according to Heidegger,

> Nothingness [*qua nichtendes Nichts*] is what makes possible the manifest character of the essent as such for the human *Dasein*. Nothingness is not the concept contrary to [that of] the essent, but belongs originarily to being itself. (1929[a])

> Nothingness does not provide us with the concept opposite to [that of] the *essent*, but belongs originarily to the essence (*Wesen*) of *being itself*. In the being (*Sein*) of the essent there occurs the nihilation (*das Nichten*) of nothingness. (1929[b])

> Everything that is not simply nothing *is*, and for us even nothing "belongs" to "being." (1935/1953[c])

> There is no being and nothingness together. The one is used for the other in a familiarity the essential plenitude of which we have not thought as yet. (1955[d])

> ...the no of the essent, "this nothingness," that is, being with regard to its essence. (1955[e])

Even more striking may seem the fact that, in the famed course he taught in 1927 (right at the beginning of the *Khere* or turnabout), Heidegger referred to Hegel's assertion, at the beginning of the *Logic*, that "being is identical with nothingness," and commented, "Hegel is on the track of a fundamental truth when he says that being and nothing are identical, that is, belong together."[f] However, from this we must not jump into hasty conclusions, for immediately thereafter Heidegger wrote, "Of course, the more radical question is, What makes such a most original belonging-together at all possible?"[g][249] And two years after stating the above, he answered this question, dispelling the illusion that his association of being and *nichtendes Nichts* could be the same as Hegel's identification of being and nothingness, by writing:[h]

> "Thus pure being and pure nothingness are the same." This phrase of Hegel's (*Science of Logic*, book I, WW III, p. 74) has full legitimacy. Being and nothingness belong to each other, but not because from the standpoint of the Hegelian concept of thinking they coincide both in their indetermination and immediacy, but because being itself is finite in its essence and only manifests in the transcendence of that *Dasein* that keeps itself outside, that throws itself to nothingness.

---

[a] Heidegger (1929), p. 115.
[b] Heidegger (1929), p. 115. Cited in Saviani (2004), p. 47, in relation to Eastern influences in Heidegger.
[c] Heidegger (1987), p 85. (The course on which this book is based was taught in 1935; however, when it was prepared for publication the author introduced new materials in it, and I cannot determine which ideas are from 1935 and which are from 1953.)
[d] Heidegger (1955), p. 419.
[e] Heidegger (1955), p. 420.
[f] Heidegger (1988), § 20, pp. 311-312 (original German Edition p. 443).
[g] Heidegger (1988), § 20, p. 312 (original German Edition p. 443).
[h] Heidegger (1929), p. 120.

Though the above dispels the idea that Heidegger's association of being to his *nichtendes Nichts* may be the same as Hegel's identity of being and nothingness, the late Heidegger's identification of being with the *arche* in *das Ereignis*, insofar as it deprives being of its *differentia specifica*, divesting it of its contrast with nonbeing, might still be thought to imply a somehow Hegelian or a *quasi*-Hegelian conception of being. At any rate, it is this identification of being with the *arche* in *das Ereignis* that directly contradicts Heidegger's assertions, which at no point of his evolution did he overly disavowed, that being "lay in language," that it was "something that had to be thought," and that the word "being" had what the German thinker called "an appellative force." In fact, it is this identification of being with the *arche*, while still maintaining the view of being as a concept that is thought, as something that lies in language, as a notion having what Heidegger called "an appellative force" and so on, that is at the root of the most outstanding of the contradictions that plague Heidegger's thought.

In fact, had Heidegger kept the distinction between being and the *arche*, making it clear that being is a concept that as such is thought, is expressed in language, and has an "appellative force" (for, when this concept is delusorily valued, a phenomenon arises that is the most basic of all delusive phenomena), whereas the *arche* (is) the true condition of all reality that *cannot* become a concept, for it has neither *genus proximum* nor *differentia specifica*, and thus cannot be thought, be expressed in language, or have an "appellative force," the contradictions that have been denounced so far would have been avoided. Then Heidegger could have added that a key aspect of the *arche* is the nothingness that allows it to manifest anything (just as the fact that a mirror has no fixed images allows it to "fill itself" with whatever images), and explicitly acknowledge this voidness or no-thing-ness to have the sense of the Taoist and Ch'an/ Zen Buddhist concept of *wu* / *mu*, which does not exclude the manifestation of essents, for essents have the nature of the *arche* and lack self-existence or substance. Finally, he could have noted that, just as the *arche* is not being, for being is a concept and the *arche* is what cannot be thought, the *arche* may not be understood as nonbeing either—nor can it correspond to logic-breaching combinations of concepts such as being-and-nonbeing or neither-being-nor-nonbeing.

At any rate, Heidegger's *Kehre* or turnabout was not sudden, but something that took place gradually over a period of many years, and at the end it led him to give up ontological analysis as well as all attempts to describe, explain and interpret *being* (probably as a result of having realized that *being* eluded all attempts to know it as object, insofar as it always manifested as *the being of something that appears as object*—which would have been the reason why he noted that being was previous to the subject-object duality).[250] It is also possible to presume that, in his last period, Heidegger admitted that the nature of reality could not be expressed in terms of digital logic. Though these discoveries should have led him to set off on the Path leading to the realization of the true condition of reality that is beyond concepts, and to stop applying the concept of being to the true nature of reality (as Plotinus did, despite his Platonic-Pythagorean-Orphic roots), he followed the course Parmenides took upon facing the two paths lying before him, and took the path of *lethe* in the belief that he was choosing the path of *noein* as the correct alternative to the path of *doxa*. As a result of this fateful decision he developed the concept of *das Ereignis* with all the inherent contradictions denounced above; he suggested that one should *think being* and "commemorate it," so that it would not fall into oblivion; he asserted that, instead of thinking *about* being, one should *think being itself*; and he said that it was

necessary to *access* being instead of merely *knowing* it, and to proceed to "inhabit" being.[251]

Herbert V. Guenther's Identification of *das Sein* with the Base or zhi[a]

Worse than all the confusions denounced in the above section is what the late Herbert V. Guenther did in *Matrix of Mystery—Scientific and Humanistic Aspects of rDzogs-chen Thought*[b] and later works,[c] for in them the brilliant Buddhist scholar identified what the Dzogchen Teachings call the Base or zhi[d] with what Heidegger called *das Sein*, and used the term "being," explicitly stating it should be understood in the sense of Heidegger's *das Sein*, as the translation of the Tibetan term zhi. Furthermore, the German Buddhologist got into the habit of expressing a series of fundamental concepts of the Dzogchen teachings by terms coined or used by the late Heidegger for expressing notions having no relation whatsoever with any of the concepts of the teachings in question. Since it would be a waste of time and energy to establish the differences between each and every one of the Dzogchen concepts that Dr. Guenther translated by Heideggerian terms, and the concepts Heidegger expressed by these terms, here I will limit myself to the discussion of the gross error consisting in the identification of what the Dzogchen Teachings call the Base or zhi with what Heidegger called *being* or *das Sein*.[252]

It is well known that Martin Heidegger used the term "ontological difference" (*ontologische Differenz*) to refer to the alleged difference between the ordinary, ontic understanding of being, and the supposedly "ontological" understanding of being that philosophy should help human beings reach and that supposedly conveyed the truth concerning being.[253] He wrote:[e]

> Being is to be laid hold of and made our theme. Being is always being of essents and accordingly it becomes accessible at first only by starting with some essent. Here the phenomenological vision which does the apprehending must indeed direct itself toward an essent, but it has to do so in such a way that the being of this essent is thereby brought out so that it may be possible to thematize it. Apprehension of being, ontological investigation, always turns, at first and necessarily, to some essent; but then, *in a precise way, it is led away* from that essent *and led back to its being*. We call this basic component of the phenomenological method—the leading back or re-duction of investigative vision from a naïvely apprehended essent to being—*phenomenological reduction*. We are thus adopting a central term of Husserl's phenomenology in its literal wording though not in its substantive intent. *For Husserl*, phenomenological reduction, which he worked out for the first time expressly in the *Ideas Toward a Pure Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy* (1913), is the method of leading phenomenological vision from the natural attitude of the human being whose life is involved in the world of things and persons back to the transcendental life of consciousness and its noetic-noematic[254] experiences, in which

[a] *gzhi*.
[b] Guenther (1984).
[c] E.g. Guenther (1999, 2000).
[d] *gzhi*.
[e] Heidegger (1988), § 21, pp. 21-2 (pp. 28-30 of original German Ed.). Hofstadter uses the same term, "being," for what I am rendering as "being" and what I am rendering as "essent." He has "Pure aversion from…" instead of "The mere turning aside from…," which appears in the version I am including here (in the second paragraph of the quote).

objects are constituted as correlates of consciousness. *For us* phenomenological reduction means leading phenomenological vision back from the apprehension of an essent, whatever may be the character of that apprehension, to the understanding of the being of this essent (projecting upon the way it is unconcealed[255]). Like every other scientific method, the phenomenological method grows and changes due to the progress made precisely with its help into the subjects under investigation. Scientific method is never a technique. As soon as it becomes one it has fallen away from its proper nature.

The phenomenological reduction as the leading of our vision from essents back to being nevertheless is not the only basic component of the phenomenological method; in fact, it is not even the central component. For this guidance of vision back from essents to being requires at the same time that we should bring ourselves forward positively toward being itself. The mere turning aside from essents is a merely negative methodological measure which not only needs to be supplemented by a positive one but expressly requires us to be led toward being; it thus requires guidance. Being does not become accessible [in the same way as] an essent. We do not simply find it in front of us. As is to be shown, it must always be brought to view in a free projection (*Entwurf*). This projecting of the antecedently given essent upon its being and the structures of its being we call the phenomenological construction.

But the method of phenomenology is likewise not exhausted by the phenomenological construction. We have heard that every projection of being occurs in a reductive recursion from essents. The consideration of being takes its starts from essents. This commencement is obviously always determined by the factual experience of essents and the range of possibilities of experience that at any time are peculiar to a factical *Dasein*, and hence to the historical situation of philosophical investigation. It is not the case that at all times and for everyone all essents and all specific domains of essents are accessible in the same way; and, even if essents are accessible inside the range of experience, the question still remains of whether, within naïve and common experience, they are already suitably understood in their specific mode of being. Because the *Dasein* is historical in its own existence, the possibilities of access and modes of interpretation of essents are themselves diverse, varying in different historical circumstances.

However, in this Heidegger was wrong, for those having no realization of what the Dzogchen teachings call rigpa, or at least of what Mahayana Buddhism calls absolute *prajña* wisdom, cannot have a really correct, ontological understanding of being: only those having such realizations are aware of the true mode of existence of the *phenomenon of being*—which, as we have seen repeatedly, is a most basic delusive appearance that is ubiquitous in *samsara*. In fact, all modes of understanding of being accessible to ordinary human beings are equally delusive, for they are grounded in the *phenomenon of being* that is a most elemental manifestation of delusion, and involve the impossibility of seeing that this phenomenon is a manifestation of delusion.[256] This phenomenon is the basis of what Heidegger called the ontological difference, for he tells us that this difference can be made because we already have an understanding of being (i.e. of the being of essents) that allows us to have the ontic understanding of the essent, and that in order to realize the ontological difference all we have to do is to move our focus from the ontic understanding of the essent to the *a priori* understanding of being that makes possible the ontic understanding of the essent.[257] Though Heidegger does not understand the term *a priori* exactly in the same sense as Kant, what I have said elsewhere concerning Kant's *a prioris* also applies to Heidegger's: in terms of the essential understanding expressed by the myth of *lila*, the

cosmic hide-and-seek game of Gnitiveness with itself, the fact that the comprehension of being is *a priori* confirms the fact that it is delusive.[258]

As stated in a note to the preceding chapter, in two of Heidegger's later works (*Was heisst Denken* and *Identität und Differenz*) the German author emphasized the view that the *ontological difference* was given within the framework of the *Dasein*, and explained the difference in question as *not* exactly a contrast between the ontic and the ontological, but rather a duplicity (*Zwiefalt*) that must be developed, a difference that was previously "undifferentiated"—so to say—but that must be clearly differentiated (i.e. be made apparent), so that being and essent would no longer be in contrast with each other. However, none of this affects Heidegger's essential error: though he conceived the ontological difference as the supreme and most significant difference, the truth is that, concerning being, the truly significant difference is the one I have called "metaontological difference:"[259] the one occurring between being (*das Sein*) *qua* the most basic manifestation of Heraclitus' *lethe* or concealment of the *physis* at the root of *samsara*, and Heraclitus' *aletheia* or unconcealment of the *physis*, which involves the dissolution of the *phenomenon of being* and corresponds to *nirvana*. Only those who have gone through the dissolution of the *phenomenon of being* have clearly realized that all that is based on that phenomenon is like a dream that absorbs our consciousness, precluding awareness of the true condition of reality, and that the dissolution of this phenomenon is like awakening from that dream into awareness of the true condition of reality. Therefore, they know that being, rather than representing, as ordinary people in general believe, the greatest possible degree of truth, authenticity and openness, is the most basic manifestation of delusion, produced by the delusory valuation of the subtle / intuitive concept of being. (People going through processes of "psychotic derealization" have glimpses of the fact that being is unreal, but in general they fail to realize the true condition of reality, for since they undergo these processes against their will, since they are utterly confused, since their environment is disorienting—and, especially, since they lack the necessary preparation, empowerment and secret oral instructions—it is extremely unlikely that they may attain the dissolution of the *phenomenon of being*.[260])

As we have seen, Heidegger was under the delusion resulting from the delusory valuation of the concept of being, and in his case this delusion was so extreme that he wrongly believed *being* to be that which unconcealed itself in *aletheia*. Even if he had really experienced a difference between two different modes of understanding of being and this difference had been the source of his concept of *ontological difference* (a thesis I find difficult to believe), to posit this difference as the crucial one would conceal the truly significant difference, which is the one I have called *metaontological difference*, which Heidegger failed to realize (and, in case his Taoist and Buddhist readings caused him to glimpse that there was something of the kind, he probably confused it with whatever it was that he referred to as "ontological difference—for he noted that the condition of possibility of the latter was the "step back," which, as will be shown below, he may have named after a phrase used by Zen Master Dogen for expressing what he viewed as the condition of possibility of the realizations of Buddhism).

We have seen that the Base (zhi[a]) of Dzogchen roughly corresponds to what the teachings of the Mahayana call Buddha-nature, absolute condition, thatness, nature of phenomena,[261] and so on, and that it also seems to correspond to what Heraclitus called

[a] *gzhi*.

physis / *logos* / *pyr*, for it (is) that which is not limited by any concept, and which is the unconditioned, unfragmented, nonconceptual (Skt. *nishprapancha*),[262] true condition of thought (including the thought of being and that of nonbeing), of all that thoughts interpret, and in general of all essents: of the *Dasein* (the human essent) we are and those *Daseinen* we are not, as well as all essents appearing as object (*alles Seiende*). Though all and everything (is) in truth the Base, which from its own standpoint certainly "does not set," when the neutral condition of the neutral base-of-all manifests, the Base is concealed from the experience of sentient beings, and then, when *samsara* becomes active, there arises the dream of multiplicity, which is taken to be absolutely real and substantial. It is when this happens that, according to the Dzogchen teachings, we need to follow a Path whereby we may come to Awaken from the dream of *samsara* and the unawareness characteristic of the base-of-all, rediscovering Dzogchen *qua* Base in the manifestation of Dzogchen *qua* Path—or, in Heraclitus' terms, obtaining the *aletheia* of the *physis*. Conversely, *das Sein* or being is, as we have seen repeatedly, the most general of concepts, which is limited, fragmentary, conditioned and conditioning, and which has an "appellative force," for the delusory valuation-absolutization of this concept gives rise to the phenomenon that is the most basic manifestation of the concealment that Shakyamuni called *avidya* (Tibetan, marigpa[a]) and that Heraclitus called *lethe*.[263] As shown in the preceding section of this chapter, if being were the Base—the true condition that unveils in *nirvana*—it would not have a "force of naming," and only realized individuals would really understand what the term indicates. Furthermore, if deluded beings were to think the Base *qua* Base, this would also give rise to a new manifestation of delusion.[264]

As noted above, for Heidegger the condition of possibility of what he called the "ontological difference" was what he called the "step back" (*Schritt zurück*). As also noted above, Master Dogen, the founder of the Japanese Soto School of Zen, spoke of a "step back," which he viewed as a necessary condition of effective Buddhist practice and realization—to the extent that one of his most renowned dicta was, "To begin with, you must learn the step back."[b] Since Heidegger read all that was available in German concerning Zen Buddhism during his lifetime, and since he had so many close contacts with Japanese practitioners of this discipline, it is quite likely that he was aware of Dogen's dictum. And, had he taken the concept of the "step back" from Dogen, no doubt he would have believed what he called "ontological difference" to be directly related with the aims and/or the method of Zen—and in so doing, because of all the reasons adduced above, he would have been utterly wrong.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have made it clear that, in *Being and Time*, the early Heidegger forced his own conceptions into Heraclitus, which he interpreted as though he were an Existential philosopher of the twentieth century—and that the later Heidegger equally forced his own conceptions into Heraclitus when he interpreted the latter's view of the *arche* in terms of the concept of *Lichtung*, when he misunderstood the example of the child playing, and again and again throughout the writings of this period. Likewise, I made it clear that Heidegger seems to have forced his own conceptions into the Eastern thought

---

[a] *ma rig pa*.
[b] Dogen, *Fukan zazenji*. Cited in Tsujimura (1970).

that he absorbed through his eager readings of Chinese and Japanese literature and his personal contacts with Asian thinkers. That I am not alone in this appreciation, is demonstrated by the following passage of Eiho Kawahara's:[a]

> In the essays Logos, Moira, Aletheia, etc. in which Heidegger deals with Greek thought, a tension prevails which, to say it somehow, leaves you without breath and almost without air. I think the reason lies in the fact that Heidegger tries to *forcedly* apprehend in Parmenides and Heraclitus his own questions. Since Asian thought resulted even farther away to him than Greek thought, his ardor multiplied, and inevitably we felt uneasy...

Furthermore, just as Heidegger misunderstood both the Greek thinkers and the Eastern thought he was so fond of, despite his acrimonious criticism of technology and in general of the essence of modernity, he failed to respond to the necessities of his time, going so far in a direction opposite to the one demanded by his time as to ask the students of his University to follow the Führer, his ideology and his policies, and as to assert Prometheus to have been the first philosopher, whom we should follow.

In the preceding chapter we saw that the error or delusion that being is, when manifesting as reality (i.e. when it sustains our perception of the phenomena "of the world" in terms of intuitive thoughts—or, in terms of Heidegger's *Being and Time*, "when, in understanding the world according the mode of being of falling prey, *being* takes on the character of *reality*"), causes us to conceive an inherent multiplicity and to perceive essents as inherently separate and disconnected from each other. As I have noted in a series of other works,[b] and as will be shown once more in the last chapter of this book, this perception and the instrumental relations that come to prevail because of its development are the very root of ecological crisis. Insofar as Heraclitus' thought, just like Buddhist and Taoist thought, denounce the delusion at the root of the crisis in question, it responds to the needs of our time, despite the fact that it dates from two and a half millennia ago. Contrariwise, in spite of the fact that Heidegger's thought—and in particular that of the *Holzwege*—is quite recent and ecologists have used it profusely in the last decades, it is conditioned by the confusion at the root of the present crisis and therefore could not help us to resolve it—no matter how insistently it may ask us to contemplate the forest from a clearing instead of using tractors to destroy it. How could today's ecologists follow a thinker who asserted Prometheus to be the first philosopher and said he has to be followed, and who asked the students of his University to follow Hitler in his military adventure?[265]

---

[a] Kawahara (1989). In Buchner (Ed. 1989), p. 196. Quoted in Saviani (2004). Author's translation of the excerpt and italics.
[b] Capriles (1977, 1986, 1994a, 2000a, 2000b, 2000c, 2003, work in progress 1, work in progress 2).

PART II

BEYOND MIND I:

AN ELUCIDATION OF THE BEING OF THE SUBJECT AND THE BEING OF OBJECTS

IV

The Dzogchen Teachings and Sartre's concepts of
Soi or Self, Being-for-Self and Being-in-Itself

Sartre's Concept of the Self and the Condition called Dzogchen

In chapter II of this volume, two modes of being were briefly outlined, which roughly correspond to the two main modes of being Jean-Paul Sartre posited in *L'être et le néant* (*Being and Nothingness*). They will have to be considered in further detail in this chapter, together with a third element of Sartre's ontology, which will be briefly defined first, for without it the other two modes of being would not make sense. The three elements to be discussed are:

(1) The *soi* or Self, which as understood by Sartre is the being of consciousness, which in his view "indicates a relation—which is precisely a duality—of the

subject with itself,"[a] and which according to the French phenomenologist and existentialist is *Value* itself. As Sartre understood it, this concept lacks clarity and distinction, and *seems* to involve a paramount contradiction; however, by modifying some of the wordings Sartre employed in its definition, the term Self can be made to refer to the holistic totality that (is) our true condition and that the Dzogchen teachings call Dzogchen. As we have seen, this condition may be viewed *qua* Base, *qua* Path and *qua* Fruit: *qua* Base, it may involve or not involve the *illusion* of duality, but whatever the case, *in truth* it does *not* involve any duality, for the subject-object[b] cleavage, the inside-outside partition, and all other dualities and divisions are baseless illusions lacking any truth whatsoever; as shown in a previous chapter of this volume, *qua* Path and *qua* Fruit it does not involve even the *illusion* of duality (below what Sartre called the *holon* was redefined so as to correspond to this condition *qua* Path and *qua* Fruit). As will be shown below, there are two valid reasons why this totality may be viewed as absolute *Value*, which is how Sartre viewed the Self: (1) it is its illusory disruption *qua* Base by the appearance of duality that gives rise to our attributing (greater or lesser, and therefore relative) value to essents, qualities, activities and so on, which means that all value is derived from it, and (2) *qua* Path and *qua* Fruit, in which it is free from this illusory disruption, there is no sense of lack that may cause us to project value on essents and so on, and hence may be viewed as the realization of absolute *Value*.[266]

(2) Being-for-Self, which is the mode of *being* of the dualistic consciousness (i.e. of that which Descartes wrongly understood as a self-existent, substantial and yet incorporeal *res cogitans*) that is under the illusion of being at a distance from the continuum of what we interpret as a physical world, and which seems to be the doer of actions and the recipient of experiences[267]—but which, in terms of the view expressed in this book, is no more than an insubstantial appearance. This means that this mode of being must be redefined as the experience of the mental subject that is indissolubly associated with deluded, dualistic consciousness *as an essent that is*. This mode of being, involving the ontological structures and functions of deluded consciousness, will be redefined here in terms somehow similar to some of those Sartre used for defining the Self as he understood it—and yet its dynamic will be shown to coincide with that of Sartre's being-for-Self.

(3) Being-in-itself, which is initially the mode of *being* of the form of manifestation of energy called tsel[c],[268] involving the continuum of the five senses universally accepted by common sense and Western psychology and physiology, as it is experienced when the *a priori* supersubtle thought called the threefold thought-structure is delusorily valued-absolutized, giving rise to dualistic consciousness:

---

[a] In Sartre (1980), pp. 118-119, we read: "Il indique un rapport du sujet avec lui-même et ce rapport est précisément une dualité, mais une dualité particulière puisqu'elle exige des symboles verbaux particuliers."
[b] Skt. *grahaka-grahya* (Tib. *'dzin - gzung*), *vishayi-vishaya/artha* (Tib. *chos can - yul/don*) or *dharmin-jñeya* (Tib. *chos can/yul can - shes bya*). (In Sanskrit the normal order of the terms is the inverse of the English: *grahya-grahaka*, *vishaya-vishayi*, etc.)
[c] *rtsal*.

as it arises, this consciousness mistakenly experiences that continuum as lying in an external dimension, as being separate and independent from itself, and as constituting a substantial, *in-itself* universe in the sense of "offering resistance to it" in which Heidegger used the terms in the key excerpt of *Being and Time* (cited in a previous chapter of this volume) in which he discusses what happens when "being takes on the character of *reality*"[a] (which caused Descartes to misinterpret the continuum in question as being a self-existent, substantial, spatial *res extensa*). Since the mind-*cum*-mental-events complex selects and singles out its objects in this continuum, this mode of being is the being of all of these objects. However, insofar as only being-for-Self experiences this continuum and all that is singled out within it as being *in-itself*, and insofar as this experience is delusory, I will refer to what Sartre called being-in-itself as being-that-is-in-itself-for-being-for-Self.[269] (It must be noted that, once dualism and the *in-itself* have manifested as a result of the arising of the tsel mode of manifestation of energy and the delusory valuation of the threefold thought-structure, and one has been conditioned by this experience, discursive and intuitive thoughts, which are phenomena of the dang[b] mode of manifestation of energy perceived through the sixth of the senses posited by Buddhism, may be experienced as being in-themselves. For example, though most of the time we have a considerable degree of control over these phenomena, in the meditation of beginners and in many other occasions they are occasionally experienced as *offering resistance* to the mental subject, which cannot control them as will.[270])

In order to clarify the meaning of Sartre's *soi* or Self and assess his understanding of it as *Value,* it is necessary to begin by making as clear as possible the meaning of being-for-Self. Sartre dedicated many pages to this in *Being and Nothingness*; however, since the view expressed in this book is different from the one Sartre molded in the book in question, it is not possible simply to refer the reader to Sartre's discussion of it. This is why, after citing some of Sartre's descriptions of this mode of being, so that his conception be clear enough, the alternative conception of this mode of being in the system expounded in this book will be expounded, and then it will be explained as precisely as possible how it differs from the French author's.

The very term being-for-Self implies that we are speaking of a mode of being that is for-something. What is it for? It is for*-the-absolute-wholeness-and-plenitude that it would have to become in order not to lack anything*, and therefore be absolute wholeness and plenitude—or, which is the same, be absolute *Value*. Therefore it may be defined as *being* in the mode of *being the lack of the absolute wholeness and plenitude* (or absolute *Value*) *that it would have to become in order not to lack anything* and thus be absolute wholeness and plenitude / absolute *Value*. In order to be in the mode of *being this lack*, this being has to determine itself as separate from all that has the mode of being that Sartre called being-in-itself and that I will call being-that-is-in-itself-for-being-for-Self.

---

[a] Heidegger (1996), pp. 187 (first paragraph in the quote) and 188 (second paragraph in the quote). Original German edition: pp. 201 and 202. I changed some words in order to adapt the quotation to the terminology used in this book.
[b] *gdangs*.

In the above point my conception of being-for-Self agrees with Sartre's, which he describes in the following terms:[a]

> Heidegger is so persuaded that Husserl's "I think" is a fascinating birdlime lark trap, that he totally avoided resorting to consciousness in his description of the *Dasein*. His aim is to show it immediately as care (*Sorge*, *souci*), that is, as fleeing from itself in the project of self toward the possibilities that he *is*.[271] It is this project of self out of self that he calls "comprehension" (*Verstand*) and that allows him to establish the human reality as being "revealing-revealed." But this attempt to show *in advance* the *Dasein*'s fleeing from itself in its turn will find insurmountable difficulties: it is not possible to suppress *in advance* the dimension "consciousness," even if this were done in order to immediately reestablish it. Comprehension has no sense unless it is consciousness of comprehension… What has the description of [being-]for-Self revealed to us [so far]?
>
> To begin with, we found a nihilation with which the being of [being-]for-Self affects itself[272] in its being. And this revelation of nothingness has not seemed to us to go beyond the limits of the *cogito*. But let's take a closer look.
>
> [Being-]for-Self cannot sustain the nihilation without determining itself as a *lack of being*. This means that the nihilation does not coincide with a simple introduction of voidness into consciousness. It is not that an external being has expelled [being-]in-itself from consciousness, but that [being-]for-Self determines itself perpetually not to be [being-]in-itself. This means that it cannot found itself except on the basis of [being-]in-itself and against [being-]in-itself. Thus the nihilation, being a nihilation of being, represents the original link between the being of [being-]for-Self and the being of [being-]in-itself. The concrete and real in-itself is in its totality present at the heart of consciousness as that which it determines itself not to be…

Sartre was right in that it was neither legitimate nor useful to suppress *in advance* the dimension "consciousness," as Heidegger did. In fact, in this chapter I have resorted to Sartre's terminology (which, as noted above, I had to redefine so that it would fit the descriptions found in the Dzogchen teachings) precisely because it will allow me to unravel the relationship between the mental subject, the object(s), and the nondual awareness in which both arise and dissolve, as well as to explain the way in which the subject establishes a link of being with the human essent appearing as object so as to *become* that essent and thereby give rise to being-for-others, the way in which the subject ascends or descends in *samsara* depending on the type and quality of the being it gets through others' perception of the essent it has become, and so on—all of which it would be impossible to describe and analyze in terms of Heidegger's jargon and way of describing.

However, in the last two paragraphs of the passage cited above it is clear that Sartre took for granted that the original condition that the Dzogchen teachings call the Base (zhi[b]) or Dzogchen-*qua*-Base and that I am now calling the Self-*qua*-Base is *being*, that through a *nihilation of being* being-for-Self determines itself in relation to what he calls being-in-itself and which I call being-that-is-in-itself-for-being-for-Self, and that since the ensuing determination is the essential determination of being-for-Self, this nihilation establishes an indissoluble, insurmountable relationship between being-for-Self and what he called being-in-itself. In terms of the view I am expressing in this book this is not so, for, as shown in a previous chapter, being *qua* absolute position / self-being is a deceptive appearance arising

---

[a] Sartre (1980), p. 128.
[b] *gzhi*.

from the delusory valuation-absolutization of thought, which as such could not occur and does not occur *in being*, but does so in the unborn Base which the Dzogchen teachings call zhi and which I am now calling the Self-*qua*-Base, which *may not be said* to be *being, nonbeing, both-being-and-nonbeing,* or *neither-being-nor-nonbeing*, for as we have seen repeatedly, insofar as it lacks both *genus proximum* and *differentia specifica*, cannot be understood in terms of *any* concept of sequence of concepts. On the basis of Tsongkhapa's outlook, we could infer that the deceptive appearance of being *qua* absolute position / self-being arises in being *qua* actuality; however, this is not so, for as we have seen being *qua* actuality is an empty, baseless appearance with no truth whatsoever that arises with relative truth, which manifests only in *samsara* and which is a deceptive appearance: as also shown in a previous chapter and as the etymology of the Sanskrit term *samvriti satya* makes it clear, *relative truth* is deluded truth or, which is the same, untruth. Therefore, it is a paramount error to assume that the primordial condition—the Base of Dzogchen that here I am calling the Self-qua-Base—is *being*, and that this being is subsequently nihilated.

In fact, only when the delusory valuation-absolutization of the subtle / intuitive concept of being gives rise to the *phenomenon of being* (which is no-thing-ness insofar as it is not a thing) there is *being*; therefore, as explained in the second chapter of this volume, only at this point may there be a nihilation of being giving rise to nonbeing. Thus rather than saying that the true, perennial condition of reality is *being*, in the midst of which nonbeing manifests, we have to say that in the true, perennial condition of reality I am calling the Self-*qua*-Base, *which is neither being not nonbeing*, the delusory valuation of the threefold thought structure with its inherent concept of being gives rise to the delusive appearance of being, which conceals the true, perennial condition in question and which makes it possible for nonbeing to manifest as a result of secondary process negation. It is on the basis of this that being-for-Self can arise by determining itself perpetually not to be being-that-is-in-itself-for-being-for-Self, thereby founding itself on being-that-is-in-itself-for-being-for-Self, by contrast with which it exists—and only once this has occurred can there manifest the experience of lack of completeness, of lack of plenitude, and of lack of value inherent in being-for-Self. Sartre goes on:[a]

> That which the ontological description has made immediately appear, is that this being (being-for-Self) is the foundation of itself *qua* lack of being, that is: it makes itself be determined in its being by a being that it is not (i.e. by the in-itself)…
>
> …there is a type of negation that establishes an internal relation between that which is negated and that with regard to which it is negated.[273] Of all internal negations, the one that penetrates deepest in being, the one that constitutes *in its being* the being *with regard to which* it negates with the being *that* it negates, is the *lack*. This lack does not belong to the nature of the in-itself, which is all positiveness. It only appears in the world with the arising of the human reality. It is only in the human world that there can be lacks. A lack supposes a trinity: that which lacks, or the lacking; that to which what lacks is lacking or the existent; and a totality that has been disaggregated by the lack and that would be restored by the synthesis of the lacking and the existent: this is what is lacked.

Sartre illustrates this by a moon that lacks a quarter to be a full moon. This moon does not lack anything, for *qua* in-itself (in Sartre's sense of the term) it is simply what it is: only human perception may view it as lacking a quarter to be full. Likewise, in itself

[a] Sartre (1980), pp. 128-129.

three quarters of a circle is an open curve; it can only be grasped as three quarters of a circle by a state of mind that lacks and therefore is conscious of lacks. Even thirst is not a lack, but a group of organic phenomena that may be grasped as lack of water by the state of mind that lacks and therefore is conscious of lacks. Likewise, desire is not a physical force; it is the call for a certain state, with regard to which a lack is perceived—just like the moon is perceived as lacking a quart, or the curve is perceived as an incomplete circle, or thirst is perceived as lack of the state without thirst.[a]

> The human reality by which the lack appears in the world, must itself be a lack… Only a being that lacks can surpass being toward [that which is] lacked.
>
> What here plays the role of the existent, is what gives itself to the *cogito* as the immediateness of desire; for example, it is this for-Self that we have apprehended as not being what it is and as being what it is not. But what can [that which is] lacked be?
>
> In order to answer this question we must go back to the idea of lack and determine more precisely the link that unites the existent to the lacked. This link could not be one of simple contiguity. If that which lacks is so deeply present, even in its absence, at the heart of the existent, it is because the existent and the lacked are at once apprehended and surpassed in the unity of the same totality. And that which constitutes itself as lack can only do so by surpassing itself toward a disaggregated grand form. Thus the lack is apparition on the ground of a totality. Besides, it hardly matters that this totality had been originally given and is now disaggregated ("the arms of the Venus of Milo lack") or that [this totality] has never been achieved as yet ("he lacks courage"). What matters, is only that the lacking and the existent be given or be apprehended as having to annihilate themselves in the unity of the lacked totality. All that lacks lacks *to*… *for*… And that which is given in the unity of a primitive arising, is the *for*, conceived as not being as yet or not being any longer, absence toward which the truncated existent surpasses itself or is surpassed, thereby constituting itself as truncated. What is the *for* of human reality?

The very term *pour-soi* or for-Self tells us what the *for* of human reality is: it is the *soi* or Self, which therefore must be a totality that can involve no lack, for it lacks nothing, as in itself it does not involve any breach, any discontinuity or any division. Sartre goes on:[b]

> The for-Self, as foundation of itself, is the arising of negation. It founds itself insofar as it denies of itself a certain being or mode of being. What it negates or nihilates, we know, is being-in-itself. But not any being-in-itself: human reality is first of all its own nothingness. What it denies or nihilates of itself as for-Self, can be but [the] *Self*. And since [this reality] is constituted in its sense by this nihilation and this presence in itself of that which it nihilates *qua* nihilated, it is *the Self as* lacked *being-in-itself* that produces the sense of the human reality. Insofar as, in its primitive relation with itself, human reality is not what it is, its relation with itself is not primitive and can only derive its sense from a first relation which is a *nil relation* (nonrelation) or [an] identity. It is the Self—that which is what it is—that makes it possible to apprehend the for-Self as not being what it is… What the for-Self lacks, is the Self—or itself *qua* in-itself.

But what is this *soi* or Self? As redefined here, it cannot be understood in terms of the concepts of being, nonbeing, both or neither—or in terms of any other concept—for if

---

[a] Sartre (1980), pp. 130-131.
[b] Sartre (1980), pp. 131-132.

the Self is the undivided, continuous totality that comprises all that belongs to the for-Self and the in-itself, then it (is) beyond duality in general and beyond the subject-object duality in particular, and hence lacks *genus proximum* and *differentia specifica*. (This explanation does not correspond to Sartre's notion, for, as seen at the very beginning of this chapter, he said the Self was the *being* of consciousness;[a] besides, he asserted it to be *individual* [which is not correct, though it could not be defined as being universal either[274]], and in one of the above-cited passages he affirmed that the Self "indicates a relation—which is precisely a *duality*—of the subject with itself"[275]). Sartre goes on:[b]

> Thus the pure event whereby human reality arises *qua* presence to the world is apprehension of itself by itself as *its own lack*. Human reality apprehends itself in its coming into existence as incomplete being. It apprehends itself as being insofar as it is not, in the presence of the singular totality which it lacks and that it is in the mode of not being it, and which is what [the reality in question] is. Human reality is a perpetual surpassing toward a coincidence with itself that is never given. If the *cogito tends* toward being, it is that by its very arising it surpasses itself toward being, qualifying itself in its being as the being to which coincidence with itself lacks in order to be what it is. The *cogito* is indissolubly linked to being-in-itself, not like a thought to its object—which would relativize the in-itself—but as a lack to that which defines the lack. In this sense the second Cartesian proof is rigorous: the imperfect being surpasses itself toward perfect being; the being that is the foundation of its own nothingness only, surpasses itself toward the being that is the foundation of its being. But the being toward which human reality surpasses itself is not a transcendent God: it is at its very heart; it is but [it-]Self *qua* totality.

We would deviate from our course if I stated all my disagreements with the above description by Sartre; suffice to say that Sartre is right in noting that this totality is not a transcendent God; however, as shown above, and contrarily to what Sartre writes, it is *not* being. Sartre goes on:[c]

> Thus this perpetually absent being that haunts the for-Self, is itself congealed into in-itself. It is the impossible synthesis of the for-Self and the in-itself: it would be its own foundation, not *qua* nothingness but *qua* being, and would keep in itself the necessary translucency of consciousness simultaneously with the coincidence with itself [characteristic] of being-in-itself. It would keep in itself this return toward itself that conditions all necessity and all foundation. But this return to itself would take place without distance; it would no longer be presence to itself, but identity with itself. In brief, this being would be exactly the Self that as we have shown is incapable of being except as perpetually evanescent relation, but would be so *qua* substantial being. Thus human reality arises as such in the presence of its own totality or Self, *qua* lack of this totality… And we may not be reproached for inventing at our own pleasure a being of this species: when the being and the absolute absence of this totality are hypostatized as transcendence beyond the world, through an ulterior movement of mediation it takes on the name of God…
>
> Human reality is in its very being suffering, for it arises to being as perpetually haunted by a totality that it is without being able to be it, precisely insofar as it could not attain the in-itself without losing itself *qua* for-Self. Therefore it is by nature unhappy consciousness, without any possible surpassing of the state of unhappiness.

---

[a] Sartre (1980), *passim*.
[b] Sartre (1980), pp. 132-133.
[c] Sartre (1980), pp. 133-134.

For the time being I will not question Sartre's assertion that the Self involves the translucency (or transparency, as often I prefer to say) of consciousness proper to being-for-Self, simultaneously with the coincidence with itself characteristic of being-in-itself. At any rate, when he said it would be its own foundation, not *qua* nothingness but *qua* being, he was not right, for, as it would be clear by now, it would be neither being nor nonbeing. Elsewhere Sartre noted that the *soi* or Self is beyond the duality of the two modes of being which are being-for-Self and what he called being-in-itself (which I call being-that-is-in-itself-for-being-for-Self), as it consists in the self-sufficient totality, characterized by fullness and plenitude, which being-for-Self tries to attain through all of its endeavors, and which Sartre identified as *Value*.[a] However, rather than saying that the Self is *Value*, I find it more correct to say that it (is) the self-sufficient totality, characterized by absolute wholeness and plenitude, which being-for-Self lacks and tries to attain through the whole of its endeavors—and then note that all value arises in relation to this lack, in the measure in which we believe something (possession, pleasure, service, appreciation of ourselves by others, status, entertainment, relationship with others, quality, or whichever it be) to be capable of allowing us to fill it.[276] Therefore, rather than saying, like Sartre, that being-for-Self is being-for-*Value*, I find it more precise to say that it is being-for-absolute-wholeness-and-plenitude, and that all value arises in relation to that which being-for-Self lacks.

I have already cautioned that Sartre's conception of the Self is quite different from the one I am expressing in this book, according to which the Self (is) what the Dzogchen teachings call Dzogchen. As seen at the beginning of this chapter, since the term Dzogchen may be understood *qua* Base, *qua* Path *and qua* Fruit, I have to speak of a Self-*qua*-Base, a Self-*qua*-Path and a Self-*qua*-Fruit. The Self-*qua*-Base is the primordial condition of total plenitude and perfection (Dzogchen) which is the true nature of all essents, and which has the three functional possibilities which are, (1) *samsara*, (2) *nirvana*, and (3) the neutral condition of the base-of-all wherein neither *samsara* nor *nirvana* are functioning. (1) In *samsara*, characterized by the duality of for-Self and in-itself, what I am now calling the Self is concealed to dualistic consciousness—the mode of being of which is, in terms of the view expressed here, being for-Self. (2) In *nirvana*, the Self is unconcealed by the "reGnition (of) its own face," on the occasion of which dualistic consciousness and the for-Self that is its *being* dissolve, together with the illusion that the continuum that physics interprets as a physical reality is being-in-itself, and hence only the patency of the Self remains: when this occurs for limited periods while on the Path I call it the Self-*qua*-Path, and when it occurs in a definitive, irreversible way as the Fruit I call it the Self-*qua*-Fruit.[277] It was already clarified that this redefinition of the Self forbids us from categorizing it as *being*, insofar as the condition of Dzogchen cannot be understood in terms of any of the four extremes. Far less could we follow Sartre in asserting it to be the being *of consciousness*, for as we have seen, the latter (as the prefix "co-" shows) is a baseless dualistic appearance that is not inherent in the Self-*qua*-Base, for it only arises in *samsara* and is not manifest in *nirvana*—i.e., it is not manifest in the Self-*qua*-Path and the Self-*qua*-Fruit. Nor could we follow Sartre in his assertion that the Self "indicates a relation—which is precisely a duality—of the subject with itself,"[278] for the Self as redefined here is utterly beyond duality.

[a] Sartre (1980), p. 136, ¶ 2.

Nevertheless, it seems that Sartre, in his own confused way, within the supposed unity of his concept of the *soi* or self, distinguished two different senses—one in which it was always the being of being-for-Self and that as such may be categorized as a self-*qua*-base, and one in which it is what being-for-Self strives to achieve and that as such may be categorized as a self-*qua*-fruit. In fact, when he asserted the *soi* or Self to be the being of consciousness he was referring to something presently manifest in samsaric human beings, but when he referred to this *soi* or Self as *holon* (a term that he used in a sense totally different from the one Arthur Koestler gave it,[a][279] which is the one in which Fritjof Capra, Ken Wilber and others use the word), understood as that which the for-Self is *for* (i.e. as what it longs to attain and lives for attaining), and which the atheist philosopher compared unto God, he was speaking of a condition that the for-Self presently lacks and aims to attain—which, nonetheless, in a sense must be the same condition of totality that according to him was always manifest as the Self, yet was unrealized by being-for-Self. However, despite the fact that being-for-Self is for Sartre being-for-achieving-the-*holon*, and so the *holon* is the *raison d'être* of being-for-Self and the aim of all human actions (even though its achievement would spell the end of being-for-Self), in his view the absolute wholeness and plenitude of the Self simply cannot be attained: it is, like Aristotle's God, Pure Act or Unmovable Motor, an impossible option—and yet it is not the same as Aristotle's God, for though all actions of the for-Self are aimed at the attainment of the Self, this is *not* because *Value*, like Aristotle's first motor, exerts upon it a *de facto* attraction, or by virtue of a character received from its being.[280]

Thus Sartre and this book agree, firstly, in asserting that the attainment of the *holon* or Self *qua*-Path / *qua*-Fruit would involve the dissolution of being-for-Self and, therefore, even if it were attained, it would not be attained by being-for-Self; secondly, in asserting that although being-for-Self is being for attaining the absolute wholeness and plenitude of the *holon* or Self *qua*-Path / *qua*-Fruit, there is nothing being-for-Self dreads the most and most frantically tries to avoid than its own dissolution, which would occur the moment the *holon* or Self (*qua*-Path / *qua*-Fruit) were attained; and thirdly, in asserting that all attempts by being-for-Self to attain the absolute wholeness and plenitude of the *holon* or Self (*qua*-Path of *qua*-Fruit) affirm being-for-Self and sustain it, and thus serve the unavowable purpose of avoiding its own dissolution. Where the two views radically disagree is, firstly, in the way the Self in all of its forms is understood and explained, and secondly, in that for Sartre it is *impossible* to attain the *holon*, whereas in the view presented in this book not only it is possible to attain the Self-*qua*-Path and the Self-*qua*-Fruit, but the process leading to the attainment of the Self-*qua*-Fruit and involving the repeated manifestation of the Self-*qua*-Path is the essential and supreme meaning of human life.

At the beginning of this chapter it was said that many of the assertions Sartre made with regard to the Self as he conceived it, could also be made with regard to the condition called Dzogchen, but that his conception of the Self was not clear and distinct and involved a paramount contradiction. That the assertions Sartre made with regard to the Self as he conceived it may also be made with regard to the condition called Dzogchen, is evidenced by the fact that according to Sartre with regard to the *holon*, and according to this book with regard to the Self-*qua*-Path / Self-*qua*-Fruit, it may validly be said that: (1) It is the overcoming of unhappy consciousness. (2) Its hypostatization and projection into a beyond would give rise to a concept roughly equivalent to the Christian concept of God (though

[a] Koestler (1967); Koestler & Smythies (1970).

not necessarily identical to it, as shown in the note appended here[281]). (3) It does not involve the duality of being-for-Self and being-in-itself. (4) It is the self-sufficient totality, characterized by coincidence with itself and by absolute fullness / plenitude, that: (a) is the ultimate aim and the very *raison d'être* of being-for-Self, but which the for-Self dreads the most insofar as the attainment of the Self would be its dissolution or extinction,[282] and (b) may be said somehow to be *Value* insofar as its illusory lack by the for-Self is the source of all projections of value. Etc.

At this point it must be shown that Sartre's concept of the Self is not clear and distinct and that it involves a paramount contradiction; however, for the arguments used to this end to be correctly understood the reader must keep in mind that whenever in phrases such as "consciousness (of) consciousness," "consciousness (of) self" and so on, Sartre places the preposition *of* within parentheses, he does so because language requires that the preposition be written, yet in what he is describing the duality, separation or distance that the preposition posits between consciousness and that of which consciousness is conscious, is simply not involved: the parentheses indicates the proposition does not stand for any fact or structure of reality. In a previous chapter it was noted that, as Paul Claudel asserted in his *Traité de la Co-naissance au monde et de soi-même*,[a] knowledge (*connaissance*) involves the co-emergence (*co-naissance*) of subject and object. Since also the term "consciousness" involves the prefix *co* that implies the duality Sartre negates by placing the preposition *of* within parentheses, in my paraphrases of Sartre's statements I will use "awareness (of)" instead of "consciousness (of)."

That Sartre's concept of the Self was not clear and distinct and that it involved a paramount contradiction is evidenced by his twofold definition of it: (A) as "*conscience non-thétique*, *non-positionelle* (*de*) *conscience*," which literally translates as "nonthetic, nonpositional[283] consciousness (of)[284] consciousness," but which in my language I render as "nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional, nonreflexive awareness (of) dualistic, thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness;" and (B) as "*conscience non-thétique*, *non-positionelle* (*de*) *soi*," which literally would translate either as, (a) "non-thetic, non-positional[285] consciousness (of) itself," which in my language is paraphrased as "nondual, non-thetic, non-positional awareness (of) itself," or as (b) "non-thetic, non-positional consciousness (of) Self,"[286] which I paraphrase as "nondual, non-thetic, non-positional awareness (of) Self." Definition (B), if rendered as (a) "nondual non-thetic, non-positional awareness (of) itself," insofar as the pronoun "itself" would then refer to nondual, non-thetic, non-positional awareness, would amount to "nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional awareness (of) nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional awareness;" since this awareness (is) a pure awareness / reflectiveness that, (being) translucent or transparent to itself, makes itself patent (to) itself, (i) the second part of the statement would be redundant; (ii), if the second part were not redundant, it would mean that awareness is incapable of reflecting anything other than its own reflectiveness, and that experience is thus impossible; and (iii), both Sartre's identification of the Self as being, and his assertion that the Self indicates a relation—which is precisely a duality—of the subject with itself, would be inadmissible.[287] If understood as (b) "non-thetic, non-positional[288] awareness (of) Self," then its meaning would depend on whether the term Self were understood in terms of definition (Ba) or in terms of definition (A): if understood in terms of definition (Ba) the objections made to

[a] In Claudel (1943).

(Ba) in this paragraph would apply to it; if understood in terms of definition (A), then what will be said below with regard to definition (A) would apply to it.

Since above we discarded the possibility that the Self as conceived by Sartre may be reduced to "nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional, nonreflexive awareness (of) nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional, nonreflexive awareness", and since Sartre asserted that "each and every positional consciousness of object is at the same time non-positional consciousness (of) itself," I see no way of understanding definition (A) except as "nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional, nonreflexive awareness (of) dualistic, thetic, positional consciousness of an object." In terms of the system expounded in this book, this may be understood to mean that the Self as conceived by Sartre is nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional, nonreflexive awareness (of) the threefold directional structuring of experience that results from the delusory valuation-absolutization of the threefold thought structure, and that as such it may be defined as "nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional, nonreflexive awareness (of) an illusory mental subject seeming to be consciousness of an object experienced as being different and separate from itself (i.e., from the subject in question)," which in most cases would be experienced as being in-itself in the traditional sense Heidegger[a] gave the term in the passage cited in a previous chapter of this volume. The Dzogchen teachings compare nondual awareness to a mirror having three aspects, which are the essence or ngowo, nature or rangzhin and energy or thukje that were discussed in a previous chapter of this volume—an image that does not imply nondual awareness to be a passive reproducer of the images of an external world, for its energy aspect is explicitly asserted to be the active producer of our experience. In terms of this image, we can illustrate the redefinition of Sartre's Self that has been just given with the appearance, in the nondual awareness illustrated by the mirror, of both the corporeal images that in *samsara* are taken as object, and of an incorporeal, illusory mental subject that seems to be at a distance from these images and that seems to be the source of the reflective capacity and function of the mirror—so that the reflective capacity and function in question also seems to be at a distance from the images taken as object, most of which are experienced as being in themselves: as already being there, as offering resistance to the mental subject, and so on. Therefore, as will be shown below, though neither the mental subject nor its objects are at a distance from the awareness represented by the mirror's reflectiveness, the mental subject and its objects appear to be at a distance from each other—and the objects seem to also be at a distance from awareness insofar as there is the illusion that awareness is a function of the incorporeal, separate mental subject. In short, the only Sartrean definition of the Self that has been found to make sense, which is (A), implies that the cleavage being-for-Self (mode of being of the subject) / being-in-itself (mode of being of the object) that Sartre acknowledges to disrupt the wholeness of the Self, is inherent in the Self (and insofar as Sartre asserted the Self to involve "a relation [which is precisely a duality] of the subject with itself," even within the subject there would be a cleavage; however, since it is impossible that there be a cleavage within the mental subject as understood here, Sartre is certainly using the term in a sense different from the one I am giving it). Now, if the Self involved a cleavage, how could it then be asserted to be wholeness or an undivided totality? This insurmountable contradiction is most clearly evident in the case of the *holon* because, insofar as all Sartre said of the Self must apply to the *holon*, if the cleavage in question were inherent in the Self, the *holon* simply could not exhibit any of the four

[a] Heidegger (1990).

characteristics listed above: (1) It could *not* be the surpassing of unhappy consciousness, which is unhappy *precisely insofar as it experiences itself as separate from the continuum in which objects are singled out*, for this causes it, (a) to lack something it would have to incorporate in order to be a totality and hence to attain wholeness and plenitude (but which it could not incorporate without disappearing *qua* apparently separate consciousness) and, (b) to experience the suffering produced by the rejection, conflict and so on that many of the objects it confronts elicit. (2) The hypostatization and projection of it into a beyond could *not* be what we call God, for God is supposed to be perfect identity and coincidence with itself and so on. (3) It could *not* be beyond the duality of being-for-Self and being-in-itself. (4) It could *not* be the self-sufficient totality, characterized by coincidence with itself and by absolute fullness / plenitude, which, (a) is the ultimate aim and the very *raison d'être* of being-for-Self, but which the for-Self dreads the most insofar as its attainment would amount to its dissolution or extinction, and (b) may somehow be said to be *Value* insofar as its illusory lack by the for-Self is the source of all projections of value.

Before we may further proceed with our arguments, we must consider Sartre's conception of a nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional awareness in greater detail:[a]

> There is no consciousness *of* this being (i.e. of the Self that according to Sartre unhappy consciousness tries to achieve), for it haunts the non-thetic awareness (of) Self. It marks it as its sense of being and it is not anymore consciousness *of* it than it is consciousness *of* itself. However, [this being] could not escape consciousness either: but insofar as it addresses being *qua* awareness (of) being, it is there. And precisely it is not consciousness that confers its sense to this being, as it does to this inkwell or to this pencil; but without this being that it is under the form of not being it, consciousness would not be consciousness, that is, [it would not be] lack: contrariwise, it is from [this being] that it derives for itself its signification of consciousness. [The Self] arises at the same time as [consciousness], simultaneously at its heart and outside it; [in fact, the Self] is absolute transcendence in absolute immanence, [and] there is no priority of consciousness over it or of it over consciousness: they make up a *couple*. No doubt it could not exist without the for-Self, but also the for-Self could not exist without it. With regard to this being, consciousness keeps itself in the mode of *being* this being, for [consciousness] is [itself this being], but as a being that [consciousness] cannot be.

Long before the above, in the Introduction to *Being and Nothingness*, Sartre writes with regard to this *soi* or Self:[b]

> There could be no nothingness of consciousness *before* consciousness. "Before" consciousness, it is only possible to conceive a fullness of being in which no element can point to an absent consciousness… Thus, renouncing the primacy of consciousness, we have discovered the *being* of the knower and found the absolute—this very absolute that the rationalists of the seventeenth century… defined and constituted as an object of consciousness. But, precisely insofar as it is an absolute of existence rather than an absolute of knowledge, it escapes the famous objection according to which a known absolute is no longer an absolute, for it becomes relative to the consciousness we have of it…[289] Furthermore, it is a non-substantial absolute. The ontological error of Cartesian rationalism lies in not having seen that, if the absolute is defined by the primacy of existence over

[a] Sartre (1980), p. 134.
[b] Sartre (1980), pp. 22-24.

> essence, it could not be conceived as a substance. Consciousness is not at all substantial; it is a mere "appearance," in that it only exists insofar as it appears…
>
> The "*percipi*" sent us to a "*percipiens*" the being of which has revealed itself to us as consciousness. Thus we would have attained the ontological foundation of knowledge, the first being to which all appearances appear, the absolute with regard to which all phenomena are relative. This is not at all the subject, in the Kantian sense of the term, but subjectivity itself, the immanence from Self to Self. We have already escaped idealism: for the latter, being is measured by knowledge, which subjects it to the law of duality… Contrariwise, we have apprehended a being that escapes knowledge and that founds it, a thought that does not give itself as representation or as the meaning of the thoughts expressed, but which is directly apprehended insofar as it is—and this mode of apprehension is not a phenomenon of knowledge, but the structure of being.

According to Sartre, the error of Descartes lay in not having seen that, if the absolute is defined by the primacy of existence over essence, it could not be conceived as a substance; in terms of the view being expressed here, it is clear that Sartre's error lay in not having seen that the absolute—that in his system is supposed to be the *soi* or Self, but which in the system being outlined here is the Self as redefined so that the term may refer to the condition called Dzogchen—could not be *being*, for being is relative to nonbeing and therefore cannot be an absolute, which if defined as that which (is) not relative, for reasons that have been reviewed again and again[290] necessarily has to (be) unthinkable, indefinable, unspeakable. In fact, it is precisely because it was understood that the absolute is what is not relative, and that the subject and the object of knowledge are relative to each other, that it was objected that it cannot be an absolute of knowledge; since Sartre agreed with this objection, it is difficult to understand how could he end up conceiving an absolute that is relative: an absolute that is *being* and that hence is relative to *nonbeing*. It must be crystal clear by now that what there (is) prior to the arising of consciousness *cannot* be said to *be*, as Sartre says, a fullness *of being*: the "fullness"[291] preceding the arising of dualistic, thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness is the *arche* or Base that, insofar as it does not exclude anything, and insofar as there is nothing wider that may include it, cannot be understood in terms of any concept (all concepts being defined in contrast with their opposites)—and in particular in terms of the concepts of being and nonbeing.

However, in the above passages, Sartre makes an important point when he states that,[a] "*Consciousness is not to any extent substantial*; *it is a mere* '*appearance*,' in the sense that it only exists to the extent that it appears." As we know, Buddha Shakyamuni negated the supposed substantiality of the human self (in the ordinary usage of the term, which is radically different from Sartre's), reducing it to an illusion that resulted from the interaction of five aggregates (Pali, *khanda*; Skt. *skandha*; Tib. *phung po*), each of which he characterized as: (1) lacking a self-nature;[b] (2) being impermanent,[c] (3) being empty,[d] and (4) being incapable of providing satisfaction and prone to give rise to suffering.[e] Since consciousness[f] was one of the five aggregates (it was explained as the aggregate of six types of consciousness) and *qua* aggregate it lacked a self and was empty (Skt., *shunya*;

---

[a] Sartre (1980), p. 23.
[b] Skt. *anatman*; Tib. dagme (*bdag med*).
[c] Skt. *anitya*; Tib. mitakpa (*mi rtag pa*).
[d] Skt. *shunya*; Tib. tongpa (*stong pa*).
[e] Skt. *duhkha*; Tib. dugngäl (*sdug bsngal*).
[f] Skt. *vijñana*; Tib. namshe (*rnam shes*).

Tib. tongpa[a]), it could hardly be viewed as substantial. Furthermore, the Sutras of the Third Promulgation (Pali, *dhammacakka*; Skt. *dharmachakra*; Tib. chökyi khorlo[b]), make it clear that individual consciousness is not the true source of action, for the thoughts, perceptions and actions that seem to be the actions of the consciousness in question are in truth the *play* of the primordial gnosis or primordial awareness inherent in the Buddha-nature containing the three kayas (which seems to be the idea Heraclitus expressed in Fr. 2 DK, discussed in a previous chapter of this volume). For example, in the *Shraddhabaladhanavataramudrasutra* we read[c]:

> "Mañjushri, in all the myriad world systems of the ten directions, all the domains of the extremists and all the mundane and supramundane activities that occur originate through the spontaneously manifest primordial gnosis of the Tathagata."

The Tathagata is the Buddha, which in this passage has the sense of Buddha-nature-*qua*-Base, which is what in this book is called the Self-*qua*-Base, and hence the primordial gnosis in question is the nondual Gnitiveness inherent in the Self-*qua*-Base. The Mahayana also reinterpreted the concepts of emptiness and lack of self-nature that, as we have seen, the Hinayana applied to consciousness and the other aggregates. The Madhyamaka school, in particular, understood emptiness in the sense of absence of self-being or substance and asserted the mind and its objects to be dependent arisings (not only in the sense of the succession of the twelve nidanas or links of the *pratitya samutpada qua* temporal sequence / "chain" of interdependent origination,[292] but especially in that of being co-emergent and mutually dependent appearances), and as such to be empty of self-being. Though in its turn the Yogachara school is widely held to deny independent existence to phenomena that seem to be external to the human mind or consciousness, but not so to consciousness or mind, Yogachara philosopher Vinitadeva affirmed that his school rejected not only the independent existence of objects external to experience or mind, but *also* that of the subjective side of experiencing.[d][293] However, it is the Buddhist philosopher Bhavya, also called Bhavaviveka[e] (who in some works expressed views typical of Mahamadhyamaka, but who is widely regarded as the founder of the Madhyamika-Swatantrika-Sautrantika subschool), who is reputed to have been the first Buddhist thinker to explicitly assert *consciousness was part of the phenomenal world*.[294]

At any rate, from the beginning the Dzogchen teachings have understood the mental subject that is the core of the illusion of a dualistic consciousness to be no more than an appearance or "something that appears"—which, however, does not appear as an object to a consciousness or subject. In Madhyamika terminology, it does not appear "directly and explicitly," but in a much more subtle way, which has been referred to as "indirect and implicit;" however, its existence will be better understood if it is explained in Dzogchen terminology, as an incorporeal phenomenon exhibiting none of the characteristic proper to tsel-energy or the five senses, for it is a dang-energy phenomenon apprehended by the sixth sense posited by Buddhism.

---

[a] *stong pa*.
[b] *chos kyi 'khor lo*.
[c] Dudjom Rinpoche (1991), vol. I, p. 206. The terminology was adapted to the one used in this book.
[d] Lipman (1983/1986).
[e] Tib. *legs ldan 'byed*, ca. 490-570 CE.

The Semde[a] series of Dzogchen teachings, in particular, illustrates primordial awareness with the already considered example of a mirror in which, when *samsara* manifest, the subject and the object(s) arise co-emergently as baseless, delusive appearances.[295] The essential Tantra of the Semde, the *Kunje Gyalpo*, makes it clear that all phenomena are the play of Awake awareness[b]:[c]

> The source of all phenomena is all creating Awake awareness.
> Whatever manifests is my essence;
> whatever occurs is my magical expression.

Furthermore, the *Senge Tsel Dzog Chenpo Gyü*[d] makes it clear that the thoughts we normally believe to be creations of the mental subject are the play of primordial, nondual awareness:[e]

> Within the complete essence of timeless realization,
> All thoughts that occur concerning the characteristics of things
> Are simply the display of primordial gnosis.

And Longchen Rabjampa makes explicit the fact that consciousness is one of the phenomena that manifest as the play of primordial awareness:[f]

> [Primordial] awareness expresses itself through its tsel[g] energy as consciousness involving conceptual elaboration,
> marked by the myriad dualistic habitual patterns that such consciousness generates.
> Since what are not objects are misconstrued as objects, there are the five kinds of sense objects;
> since what has no identity is invested with identity, there are the five afflictive emotions.
> These constitute all possible confused perception—of the universe and the beings within it.
> Even what manifests as *samsara* arises due to that tsel energy,
> but when this is not realized, the manifestation itself is one of erroneous perception.

In the West, throughout the second millennium CE, most mainstream philosophers conceived consciousness as a substance. For example, Descartes applied systematically the technique he called "methodic doubt," not because he was a Skeptic that wanted to refute all beliefs of common sense, religion and philosophy, but in order to find a truth that could not be doubted and that therefore could serve as cornerstone for building a substantialistic metaphysical system that would dispel the metaphysical uncertainty unleashed by the Skeptic *nouveaux pyrrhoniens*.[h] And, when in his discursive meditation he had the intuition, produced by the delusory valuation-absolutization of the supersubtle conceptual structure known as the "threefold thought-structure," that he was the thinker of thought—

---

[a] *sems sde*.
[b] *kun byed rgyal po* (Skt. *kulaya raja*).
[c] Quoted in Longchen Rabjam (2001b, p. 65).
[d] *Seng ge rtsal rdzogs chen po'i rgyud*.
[e] Quoted in Longchen Rabjam (2001b, p. 106).
[f] Longchen Rabjam (2001a, pp. 40/41; 2001b, p. 113). The terminology was adapted to the one I use in this book.
[g] *rtsal*.
[h] This is the thesis upheld in Popkin (1979), to which I have adhered at least since Capriles (1994a).

an intuition that he expressed syllogistically as "I think, therefore I am" (*je pense, donc je suis*; *cogito ergo sum*)—he concluded that this was the indubitable truth that he sought, and so set out to built on this foundation the metaphysical system that he wished would validate the assumptions common sense and the sciences, and the dogmas of the Catholic church.[296] A. J. Ayer retorted, centuries later, that from the idea that "there is a thought" it does not follow that "I exist."[a] However, so long as thoughts are accompanied by the appearance that a mental subject is thinking them, that subject exists. The true point is, therefore, that this subject exists as a baseless appearance produced by the delusory valuation-absolutization of the threefold thought-structure, and therefore it is neither substantial nor self-existent: it only exists as actual relative truth, which, as it was shown in a previous chapter of this volume, and as the etymology of the term *samvriti satya* makes it clear, is deluded truth, or, which is the same, untruth.

After Descartes, most Western philosophers continued to conceive consciousness as substantial. Hume was perhaps the first modern, systematic Western philosopher to have concluded that the mind was a chimera. As an empiricist, he asserted that only impressions manifesting in experience are real, and since he understood by "impression" our most vivid perceptions on the basis of direct sensations or on the basis of passions (but not so the impression I call the "mental subject," which insofar as it does not involve sensations of any of the five senses occupying space and perceivable as object did not fit his conception of an "impression"), he concluded that we have no impression of the mind, which therefore he had to declare baseless and explain as an assemblage of "bundle" of impressions or ideas.[297] For his part, Nietzsche attributed supreme value to the dissolution of individuality in Dionysian communion; insofar as the fact that individuality could dissolve and manifest again implied the insubstantiality of the individual self and mind, he rejected the assumed substantiality of these. Hume was a Skeptic insofar as he did not pronounce himself as to whether or not sensory impressions actually reflect an external world, and, if so, to what extent do they reflect it and how do they arise. Nietzsche went farther and coincided with Madhyamika philosophy in asserting that whatever may be thought must necessarily be false.

As we have seen, roughly at the time of Shakyamuni, in Fr. 2 DK, Heraclitus suggested that all thought, perception and action are the *play* of the universal *logos* (or, in Dzogchen terms, of the thukje or energy aspect of the Base) and that yet all human beings believed they had an intellect of their own. This implies that, rather than *actually being* the receiver of perception, the thinker of thought and the doer of action, the mental subject is a baseless appearance (in terms of the system expounded here, it is a supersubtle thought that appears in *samsara* and dissolves in *nirvana*) that *seems to be* the receiver of perception, the thinker of thought and the doer of action.[298] Neither Sartre nor Hume carried their view of consciousness as an insubstantial appearance so far as this; among modern Europeans, we find what seems to be a genuinely Heraclitian understanding of human consciousness in Georg Christoph Lichtenberg, who received the influence of Hume, but who, not being a British empiricist but a German thinker rooted in the tradition of his country, was not prone to reduce the baselessness of the subject to the absence of an impression of the kind Hume

[a] Ayer (1981).

required. Lichtenberger dismounted the Cartesian illusion of the *cogito* with his relevant intuitions—some of which may be subsumed under the following statement:[a]

> [It would be better to use an impersonal formula and, rather than saying *I think*,] to say "*there is thinking*," just as one says "there is lightening."

"There is thinking," and since this thinking always involves the delusorily valued-absolutized threefold thought structure, it always involves the illusion that the mental subject is the thinker of thought—which, however, is no more than another thought that occurs (as we have seen, it is one pole of the super-subtle thought called the "threefold thought-structure," which as all thoughts is an structure of dang energy). Mexican poet Octavio Paz expressed this idea in poetic terms:

> ...las palabras que me piensan al pensarlas;
> soy la sombra que proyectan mis palabras.
> (…the words that think me as I think them;
> I am the shadow projected by my words.)

Even though both in Western philosophy and in Eastern Paths of Awakening and associated philosophical systems there are precedents of the view of consciousness as an insubstantial appearance (such as those considered above and some that will be considered below, among others), Sartre's way of explaining the insubstantiality of consciousness was a universal philosophical landmark. His breakthrough consisted in positing a nondual, nonreflexive, nonthetic, nonpositional awareness which makes all consciousness possible, and which underlies the dualistic, thetic, positional consciousness of object. However, his explanation seems to have the defect of assuming dualistic, thetic, positional consciousness of object to be inherent in nondual, nonreflexive, nonthetic, nonpositional awareness and hence not to be eradicable. And yet by modifying his view in the right way, it can be made to explain in rigorous philosophical terms the view of Dzogchen that the Semde series of teachings illustrate in nonphilosophical terms with the example of the primordial mirror in which both dualistic consciousness and its objects manifest as the play of the mirror's energy. To this end, suffice to make clear that dualistic consciousness, (1) is not inherent in nondual awareness, but arises when the delusory valuation-absolutization of the threefold thought structure causes the mental subject—an incorporeal phenomenon of dang energy—to manifest in nondual awareness co-emergently with the phenomenon of being that makes the subject in question appear to involve self-being, as a result of which the mental subject seems to be a separate perceiver of experiences, thinker of thought and doer of action, and the Gnitive capacity of nondual awareness seems to lie in the subject in question—so that the compound of these two seem to be an individual, separate, autonomous dualistic consciousness; (2) together with the phenomenon of being, is the core of the basic human delusion that is at the root of unhappy consciousness; and (3) can dissolve in *nirvana*, putting an end to the unhappy consciousness inherent in it. This was briefly made above in this chapter, and will be done in greater detail below.

The view in question—which not only corresponds to the image of the mirror used in the Semde series of Dzogchen teachings, but also coincides with the view expressed in

---

[a] Adapted from Lichtenberg (1995), section "Causes," p. 214, and Koyré, Alexandre, 1973, p. 17 (cited in Capriles [1994a]).

Fr. 2 DK of Heraclitus as understood in a previous chapter of this volume—implies that Gnitiveness and motility, and therefore all cognitions, rather than being actions of a supposedly individual, separate and autonomous dual, thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness, are *functions* of the energy aspect of nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional, nonreflexive awareness that is the most conspicuous manifestation of the universal Heraclitian *logos* in human beings.[299] However, since this implies that nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional, nonreflexive awareness can function in a dualistic, thetic, positional, and reflexive way, one might wander whether or not it may be strictly defined as nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional and nonreflexive. The answer is in the positive, for dual, thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness is an illusion produced by the confusion of a phenomenon of dang energy with the Gnitive capacity of nondual awareness, which manifests only in *samsara* and belongs to relative truth—which as the etymological sense of the Sanskrit term *samvriti satya* shows, is deluded truth. In fact, although that primordial nondual awareness manifests a dualistic functioning, *in itself* it (is) nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional and nonreflexive—just as hairs do not fall from the head of a bald man even though this man, suffering from cataract, constantly sees falling hairs. At this point it must be clarified that one of my differences with Sartre, which I failed to point out when I cited the relevant passages, is that the nihilating power—and in general all powers—he attributed to being-for-Self are in truth powers and functions of the nondual awareness inherent in the Self. Below it will be seen that this was one of the reasons why I had to deviate from his definition of being-for-Self.

Long before Sartre, some of the great Buddhist philosophers regarded awareness of consciousness as the condition of remembrance; according to Paul Williams,[a] this has been done *at least* since, in *Pramanasamuchchaya* 1:11d, Acharya Dignaga (480-540 CE) stated that whenever we have a memory of having seen the aspect of blue we also have the memory of having had ourselves the experience of seeing this aspect (i.e., that having the memory of the aspect of blue implies having the memory of *having been conscious of* this aspect)—from which it may be inferred that, at the time the remembered perception of blue occurred, it was accompanied by an awareness (of) being conscious of seeing the aspect of blue. Dignaga's direct disciple, the philosopher Dharmakirti, was renowned for stating that for perception to be possible there had to be some kind of awareness of the fact that one is perceiving. In order to demonstrate that this is so, some of the Buddhist philosophers who subsequently upheld this thesis asserted that if there were no awareness (of) consciousness (i.e. if there were no awareness that one is conscious of whatever one is conscious of) then what there would be, would be insentience: since stones do not know, they are not aware that they know, but all beings that know have awareness (of) their knowing. Among these philosophers, the first to have used this argument seems to have been Shantarakshita, for, as Paul Williams has remarked, whenever Prajñakaramati[b] and Mokshakaragupta[c] referred to the fact that awareness [of] consciousness is the reverse of insentience, they quoted the *Madhyamakalamkaravritti* by Shantarakshita.[d]

[a] Williams (1998), p. 9.
[b] In Shantideva (1960).
[c] Mokshakaragupta (1985).
[d] Williams (1998), p. 25.

In Western philosophy, Descartes introduced the term *apercevoir* ("to apperceive") to refer to those perceptions of which we are conscious.[a][300] Leibniz distinguished between perception, which represents a multitude in unity or in a simple substance, and what he called apperception,[301] which corresponded to consciousness, and noted that Descartes and the Cartesians only accounted for the perceptions of which there is consciousness—which Leibniz called "apperceptions"[b]—but that there were also perceptions which were confuse and obscure, like the ones some monads have in stunned states. This sums up the history of the term "apperception" before Kant used it to refer to the awareness that one is perceiving (which, in his characteristic way, he divided into "empirical apperception," proper to a subject having an inner sense of the flux of appearances, and "pure apperception," which was the condition of possibility of all consciousness, including the empirical one).[c] Shortly after Descartes coined the term *apercevoir* and before Leibniz made the distinctions just considered, Spinoza had introduced the concept of an *idea ideæ* to refer to what could be called "knowledge of knowledge." However, I do not know of any philosopher writing in European languages before the twentieth century who boldly asserted that *for perception to be possible at all there had to be awareness of the fact that one is perceiving*: I believe the first to posit this thesis in an European language was Alain (Emile-Auguste Chartier[302]). However, like the Eastern philosophers listed above, Alain failed to explain that the awareness of consciousness he deemed to be a necessary condition of all consciousness had to be what Sartre referred to as nonthetic, nonpositional consciousness (of) consciousness and which here I redefined as nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional, nonreflexive awareness (of) a mental subject that seems to be a dualistic, thetic, positional and sometimes reflexive conscious[ness] of objects. Sartre writes:[d]

> What may this consciousness of consciousness be? We are to such a point under the illusion of the primacy of knowledge, that we are immediately ready to make of consciousness of consciousness an *idea ideæ* in the manner of Spinoza—that is, a knowledge of knowledge. Alain, upon expressing the evidence that "to know, is to have awareness of knowing," translates it into these terms: "To know, is to know that one knows…" [By these words what he defined was] *reflection*, or positional consciousness of consciousness, or even better, knowledge of consciousness [which would imply a dualistic, thetic, positional consciousness that would have as its object a dualistic, thetic, positional consciousness]…
>
> It does not seem that we can accept this interpretation of awareness of consciousness. The reduction of consciousness to knowledge, in fact, implies that the subject-object duality that is typical of knowledge is introduced in consciousness. But if we accept as a law the couple knower-known, a third term would be necessary for the knower to become in its turn know, and we would be before this dilemma: either (1) we stop at some point in the series known – knower known by the knower – etc. and therefore the totality of the phenomenon falls into the unknown—that is, as the last term [of the series] we always fall upon a non-conscious reflection of [it]self; or else (2) we assert the need for a regression to infinity (*idea ideæ ideæ*…, etc.), which is absurd.

[a] Descartes (1990), I 19.
[b] Leibniz (1992), § 14.
[c] Kant (1966): A (1st German Ed.) p. 107.
[d] Sartre (1980), pp. 18-19.

The problem Sartre is expressing here is due to the fact that, if it were correct that for there to be dual, thetic, positional consciousness there would have to be a dual, thetic, positional consciousness of this consciousness, then for there to be dual, thetic, positional consciousness of consciousness, necessarily there would have to be dual, thetic, positional consciousness of consciousness of consciousness; likewise, for there to be consciousness of consciousness of consciousness, necessarily there would have to be dual, thetic, positional consciousness of consciousness of consciousness of consciousness; for there to be consciousness of consciousness of consciousness of consciousness, there would have to be dual, thetic, positional consciousness of consciousness of consciousness of consciousness of consciousness… and so on *ad infinitum*. Therefore, if (1) we stopped at some point in this series, there would simply be no consciousness, for at each and every point a dual, thetic, positional consciousness of the last consciousness of the series would be necessary as the conscious foundation of the rest of the series that serves as a conscious foundation for the dual, thetic, positional consciousness of object that is the first link of the chain. However, if (2) we posited the need not to stop at any point of the series, then we would be positing an infinite series of consciousnesses manifesting simultaneously, which would be utterly absurd. Sartre goes on with his discussion:[a]

> Thus the need to found knowledge ontologically would bring about a new need: that of founding it epistemologically. May it be that we must *not* introduce into consciousness the law of the couple knower-known? [In fact], consciousness of itself is not a couple [knower-known]. If we want to avoid the regression to infinity, it is necessary that [consciousness of itself] be an immediate, non-cognitive relation from self to self.
>
> Besides, reflexive consciousness posits the reflected-upon consciousness as its object: I bring, in the act of reflection, judgments with regard to the reflected-upon consciousness—I am ashamed of it, I am proud of it, I want it, I reject it, etc. [Contrariwise,] the immediate awareness that I have of perceiving does not allow me to judge, to want, or to be ashamed. It does not *know* my perception; it does not *posit* it: all that my present consciousness has of intention is directed to the outside, to the world. On the contrary, this spontaneous awareness[303] of my perception is *constitutive* of my perceptual consciousness. In other words, each and every positional consciousness of object is simultaneously non-positional awareness of itself. If I count the cigarettes in this box, I have the impression that an objective property of this group of cigarettes is unveiling to me: *they are twelve*. This property appears to my consciousness as a property existing in the world. I can quite likely have no positional consciousness of counting them. I don't "know myself as counting." The proof is that the children who are able to make additions spontaneously, are subsequently unable to *explain* how they did it: the tests by Piaget that demonstrate this are an excellent refutation of Alain's formula, "To know, is to know that one knows." And yet, the moment the cigarettes unveil themselves to me as being twelve, I have a non-thetic awareness of my additive activity. In fact, if I am questioned, if I am asked, "what are you doing?" I will immediately reply "I am counting," and this reply does not point solely to the instantaneous consciousness that I can attain through reflection, but also to those that have passed without having being object of reflection, those that are forever *unreflected* in my immediate past. Thus there is not any kind of primacy of reflection with the reflected-upon consciousness: it is not [reflexive consciousness] that unveils [the reflected-upon consciousness] to itself. Contrariwise, it is non-reflexive awareness that makes reflection possible: there is a pre-reflexive *cogito* that is the condition of the Cartesian *cogito*. At the same time, it is the non-

[a] Sartre (1980), pp. 19-21.

thetic awareness of counting that is the very condition of my additive activity. If it were otherwise, how could addition be the unifying theme of my [successive] consciousnesses? For this theme to preside over a whole series of syntheses of unifications and recognitions, it is necessary that it be present to itself, not as a thing, but as an operative intention that can only exist as "revealing-revealed," to use Heidegger's expression. Thus, for counting, it is necessary to be aware of counting.

No doubt, it will be retorted, but there is a circle. For is it not necessary that *in fact* I count for me to have awareness of counting? This is true. However, there is no circle, or, if one so wishes, it is the very nature of consciousness to exist "in circle." This is what may be expressed in these terms: every conscious existence exists as awareness of existing. Now we understand why the first awareness of consciousness is not positional: it is because it is one with the consciousness of which it is awareness. It determines itself at once as awareness of perception and as perception. The needs of syntax have obliged us so far to speak of "nonpositional awareness *of* consciousness."[a] But we can no longer use this expression in which the "*of* consciousness"[b] still elicits the idea of knowledge. (From now on we will put the "of" within parentheses, in order to indicate that it only responds to a grammatical constraint.)

This awareness (of) consciousness[c] must not be regarded as a new consciousness, but as *the only possible mode of existence of a consciousness of anything whatsoever*. Just as an extended object is constrained to exist in terms of the three dimensions, likewise an intention, a pleasure, a pain can only exist as immediate awareness (of) themselves. The being of the intention can only be awareness, for otherwise the intention would be a thing (i.e. an object) in consciousness. Hence one must not understand here that some external cause (an organic trouble, an unconscious impulsion, another "erlebnis") could determine the production of a psychological event—for example, a pleasure—and that this event thus determined in its material structure would be constrained, on the other hand, to be produced as awareness (of) itself. This would amount to making of nonthetic awareness a *quality* of positional consciousness (in the sense that perception, which is the positional consciousness of this table, on the top would have the quality of awareness (of) itself) and therefore [it would amount] to falling again into the illusion of the theoretical primacy of knowledge. Beside, it would amount to making a thing of the psychological event, and then *qualifying* it as conscious as I can qualify, for example, this blotting paper as being pink.[304] Pleasure cannot be distinguished—even theoretically—from awareness of pleasure. The awareness (of) pleasure is constitutive of pleasure, as the very mode of its existence, as the matter of which it is made rather than as a form that would be imposed subsequently to a hedonistic matter. Pleasure cannot exist "before" awareness of pleasure—even under the form of virtuality, of potentiality. A pleasure in potency could only exist as awareness (of) being in potency; there are no virtualities of consciousness except as awareness of virtualities.

Reciprocally, as I showed above, it is necessary to avoid defining pleasure in terms of the consciousness I have of it. This would amount to falling into an idealism of consciousness that would take us through roundabout ways to the primacy of consciousness. The pleasure must not dissolve behind the awareness it has (of) itself: it is not a representation; it is a concrete event, full and absolute.[305] It is *not to any greater*

---

[a] In the original, *conscience non-positionelle de soi* or "nonpositional consciousness of [it]self;" I was obliged to modify Sartre's wording in the translation because I introduced the distinction between nondual awareness and dualistic consciousness.
[b] In the original, *de soi* or "of [it]self;" cf. the preceding footnote for the reasons for the change.
[c] Cf. footnote before last.

> *extent* a quality of the awareness (of) pleasure[a] than the awareness of pleasure[b] is a quality of pleasure. Just as *there is not, to begin with*, a consciousness that immediately thereafter would receive the affection "pleasure," as water may be colored, *there is not, to begin with*, a pleasure (unconscious or psychological) that immediately thereafter would receive the quality of [being] conscious, as though a beam of light [were to fall on it]. There is an indivisible, indissoluble being—not at all a substance sustaining its qualities as smaller beings, but a being that is existence throughout. The pleasure is the being of the awareness (of) itself, and the awareness (of) itself is the law of being of pleasure…

Sartre continues with most interesting reflections, but these are not essential to the aims of this book. What we are concerned with is Sartre's thesis that all consciousness is made possible by a nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional awareness that (as the parentheses he puts around the proposition warn) does not take consciousness as object—which is a true philosophical feat. In fact, as we have seen, the idea was implicit in the Semde series of Dzogchen teachings's comparison of nondual primordial awareness with a mirror in which, while *samsara* is manifest, subject and object arise and dissolve with each and every cognition. However, to my knowledge so far no one, East or West, had expressed this idea in philosophical terms. Furthermore, by so doing he was providing the basis for the *missing explanation* of the true nature and structure of the spontaneous awareness of consciousness / perception that was implicit in Dignaga and explicit in Dharmakirti, Shantarakshita and others of the greatest Buddhist philosophers, and at the same time he was unknowingly removing the grounds for the objections some of the most important Madhyamika-Prasangika philosophers raised against this spontaneous awareness. (For an explanation of why this is so, cf. the upcoming definitive edition in print of Capriles [2004].)

With regard to the mirror the teachings of the Dzogchen Semde use as a metaphor for primordial awareness, Gnitiveness, nature of mind or however we call it, the teachings in question emphasize the fact that a mirror cannot judge its reflections in order to accept or approve of some and reject or disapprove of others, for the reflections are not at a distance from the mirror and the mirror cannot experience them as being separate from it. However, when the delusory valuation-absolutization of the threefold thought structure produces the illusory mental subject, which as we have seen is an incorporeal phenomenon of dang energy manifesting in nondual awareness or Gnitiveness, and the confusion of the subject in question with the Gnitiveness inherent in nondual awareness gives rise to the illusion of a positional, thetic, reflexive consciousness, the dualistic structure introduced by the subject-object duality requires that everything be made to fit into a dualistic structure, and therefore demands the dualistic qualification of the object as something to be accepted or something to be rejected (or something to remain indifferent to)—which, as shown in a previous chapter of this volume, will result in a pleasant or unpleasant (or neutral) sensation, according to the case. However, when the illusory positional, thetic, reflexive consciousness dissolves on the occasion of reGnizing primordial nondual Gnitiveness / awareness, there can be no judging, wanting or being ashamed. It is therefore natural—and yet astonishing because of the coincidence with the Dzogchen teachings, which Sartre was unaware of—that in the above-quoted passage the French philosopher said with regard to nonthetic, nonpositional, nonreflexive awareness that, "the immediate awareness that I have of perceiving does not allow me to judge, to want, or to be ashamed..."

---

[a] In the original, *conscience* (*de*) *soi* or "consciousness (of) itself."
[b] In the original, *conscience* (*de*) *soi* or "consciousness (of) itself."

Nevertheless, as noted above, since Sartre never had any realization of *nirvana*, he implied that nondual, nonreflexive, nonthetic, nonpositional awareness was *always and necessarily* (a) nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional awareness (of) *dualistic*, *thetic*, *positional consciousness* of object, and (b) nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional awareness (of) *being*. Had *nirvana* manifested in his continuum at least once, he would have had the certainty that this is not so, for in *nirvana* nondual spontaneous awareness no longer involves *either* (a) dual, thetic, positional consciousness, *or* (b) the phenomenon of being. Moreover, an intensive yogic practice making patent what I have called the "metaontological difference"[a] might have allowed him to realize that both dual, thetic, positional consciousness and the phenomenon of being result from the delusory valuation-absolutization of the super-subtle threefold thought-structure, which as shown in a previous chapter of this volume is a directional thought structure implicitly involving the concept of being (for it conceives a subject-that-is, an experience/action-that-is, and an object-that-is).

In the last of the passages cited above another coincidence between Sartre's thought and Buddhist thought is implicit. In fact, since affections are not permanent, the fact that Sartre notes that there is no pre-existing consciousness that at some point would receive the affection "pleasure" (or that would receive any other affection, for that matter) implies that in each different event of cognition consciousness arises as consciousness of this or consciousness of that—which is the standard Buddhist view. However, the consciousness that, from a conventional standpoint,[306] arises with each event of cognition and dissolves as the event ceases, is the illusion of dualistic, thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness that, as we have seen, arises as a result of the confusion of the illusory mental subject that is an incorporeal phenomenon of dang energy, with the Gnitiveness and motility of primordial, nondual awareness. As the higher forms of Buddhism point out, and as Sartre seemingly failed to realize, the same is not the case with primordial nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional, nonreflexive awareness, which (as reflected by the etymology of the Tibetan term gyü[b], which translates the Sanskrit word *tantra*[307]) is uninterrupted and continuous, and which, being free of the four characteristics of the conditioned,[308] cannot be said to arise or cease—being in fact comparable to a changeless, immutable primordial mirror in which dualistic, thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness (with its two poles, which are the mental subject and the object) manifests like a reflection in each event of cognition. In fact, the mental subject manifests as subject and the object manifests as object *in primordial, nondual awareness*, and though the mental subject and the object *appear to be* at a distance *from each other*, just as reflections in a mirror that are not at a distance from the mirror's reflectiveness, neither the mental subject not its objects are at a distance from the nondual awareness in which they manifest (by "objects" I mean the objects *in our experience*, or, which is the same, the noematic pole of knowledge: there is no point in breaching the metaphenomenological *epoche* and asserting the absence of anything that is not awareness or that is different and separate from awareness—though we may certainly posit a basis free from discrete, concrete forms and from dimensionality as we know it, on the basis of which discrete and concrete dimensional experience arises[309]).

---

[a] This difference is discussed in detail in Capriles (work in progress 3); it is dealt with in lesser depth in the preceding chapter of this book, as well as in Capriles (undated).
[b] *sems rgyud*.

According to the Dzogchen teachings, manifestation begins with the dang[a] mode of expression of energy, which as shown in chapter I of this volume, is a transparent, pure, clear, limpid, and intangible dimension that is neither internal nor external, and the nature of which is the *dharmakaya*. The second mode of expression of energy to manifest is rölpa[b]—which is visible but not tangible insofar as it has the characteristics of the nature of the elements, consisting in light of the corresponding colors; which is refractory to the inside-outside cleavage; and the nature of which is the *sambhogakaya*. And the third mode of expression of energy to manifest is tsel[c], which is illustrated by the metaphor of a crystal prism through which white light passes, thereby being separated into a spectrum that is projected into an external dimension—for it comprises those phenomena that appear to lie in an "external dimension" (the phenomena we call "physical," which are visible and tangible, being its paradigmatic expression)—and the nature of which is the *nirmanakaya*. The dang mode of manifestation of energy is illustrated by the metaphor of a crystal ball, not only because crystal balls, like dang energy, are transparent, pure, clear and limpid, but because, after the manifestation of tsel energy, whatever manifests in dang energy seems to lie in an "internal dimension or jing," just as do the reflections of external phenomena in a crystal ball (the metaphor of *reflections of external phenomena* in a crystal ball, in its turn, illustrates the fact that, once tsel energy manifests, in events such as remembrance, fantasy, etc., dang energy reproduces the phenomena of tsel energy in its own dimension, which has become "internal" in relation to "external" tsel energy). It is important to note that it is in our experiences with tsel energy that the *a priori* (in the Kantian sense) apparitional threefold directional structuring of experience and the illusion of in-itself / substantiality (in the sense the words have in the passage from Heidegger's *Being and Time* cited in a previous chapter of this volume) become actual, for, as we have seen, originally dang energy is beyond the subject-object / inside-outside dichotomy and free of the illusion of substantiality / in-itself, all of which manifest in experience after tsel energy manifests as an external dimension and is taken as object—of which the mental subject, being a phenomenon of dang energy lying in the internal dimension, therefore seems to be at a distance, and which the mental subject experiences as something that makes resistance to it (i.e., as in-itself / substantial). Once the appearances of a subject-object schism and of substantiality / in-itself have become actual and firmly established through our repeated dealings with tsel energy, they also manifest with regard to phenomena of dang energy (however, as will be shown below, in the case of dang energy the experience of in-itself / substantiality never is as radical as in the case of phenomena of tsel energy—and even in the case of the body, despite the fact that it is a phenomenon of tsel energy, the experience in question is not as radical as in the case of phenomena of tsel energy other than the body).[310]

In fact, as we have seen repeatedly, the mental subject pertains to the dang[d] mode of manifestation of energy, which is incorporeal, insubstantial (in the sense of "lacking concreteness") and transparent, and does not feature characteristics that may be perceived through the senses accepted by common sense and Western physiology and psychology. The subject in question arises as one of the two poles of the threefold directional,

---

[a] *gdangs*.
[b] *rol pa*.
[c] *rtsal*.
[d] *gdangs*.

intentional, experiential structure that, after and thanks to the emergence of tsel energy,[311] manifests in the dang[a] mode of expression of energy as a result of the delusory valuation-absolutization of the supersubtle threefold thought-structure, and that is involved in all dualistic cognizing, thinking, intending and acting. In practice, the subjective pole of this threefold directional, intentional experiential structure, insofar as it is intrinsically linked to the Gnitiveness depending on the organism that the Menngagde[b] or *Upadeshavarga* series of Dzogchen teachings refer to by the Tibetan term semnyi[c] (which is defined in contrast with the chönyi[d], which does not depend on the organism and which is the true nature of those phenomena that we experience as lying in an external dimension), can have *a certain degree* of control over aspects of the spontaneity of nondual awareness associated with phenomena pertaining to dang energy such as subtle / intuitive and coarse, discursive thoughts; through these, it has *a certain degree* of control over what Tantric and Dzogchen energetics call "winds" (Skt. *vayu* or *prana*, according to the case; Tib. lung[e]);[312] and through these, to a great extent it controls the organism's voluntary muscles pertaining to the tsel[f] mode of manifestation of energy, controlling the body's actions: *all that the mental subject can directly control is within the bounds of the organism on which the semnyi depends*.

All intentions, thoughts, cognitions, perceptions, actions and so on, are in truth the play of the energy aspect of the Gnitiveness / motility[g] depending on the organism (i.e., the semnyi in the sense the term is given in the Menngagde or *Upadeshavarga* series of Dzogchen teachings), and since the latter is a manifestation and function of universal, primordial nondual awareness, they are ultimately the play of the energy of this awareness. However, since the delusory valuation of the threefold thought structure results in the threefold directional, intentional structure of experience having the *seemingly* noetic pole that is the mental subject, and the *seemingly* noematic pole that is the latter's objects,[313] the *illusion* arises that the Gnitiveness / motility depending on the organism that the *Upadeshavarga* or Menngagde[h] calls semnyi[i] is a separate, independent, autonomous capacity of cognition and action inherent in the mental subject, which appears to be a self-sufficient knower of information, perceiver of impressions, thinker of thought, conceiver of intention and source of action (an illusion that the subject wrongly confirms as true by its seeming capacity to exert some degree of control over thoughts, winds, voluntary muscles and action). As we have seen, it is this illusion of the incorporeal mental subject as a separate, autonomous soul or mind that is the thinker of thought, the harborer of intention, the perceiver of impressions, and the doer of action (and also as the lord and owner of consciousness, of the sphere of dang energy, and in general of the inner dimension or jing), which Sartre called thetic, positional, potentially reflexive consciousness. This implies that when Sartre asserted the *being of intention* to be awareness,[314] he was extremely imprecise,

---

[a] *gdangs*.
[b] *man ngag sde* or *man ngag gyi sde*.
[c] *sems nyid*; Skt. *chittata* or *chitta eva*.
[d] *chos nyid*; Skt. *dharmata*.
[e] *rlung*.
[f] *rtsal*.
[g] In the sense of "moving or having the power to move spontaneously" and therefore as a rough synonym of "spontaneity."
[h] *man ngag sde* or *man ngag gyi sde*.
[i] *sems nyid*; Skt. *chittata* or *chitta eva*.

for the *being of intention* (is) nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional awareness (of) intention as *having being*, whereas the being of the intender (is) nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional awareness (of) the mental subject that is the core of dual, thetic, positional consciousness, as *an existing, intentional essent harboring an intention*.

The characteristics the Dzogchen teachings attribute to awareness, such as clarity, purity and limpidness, and the characteristic Sartre attributed to consciousness, which here has been more precisely expressed as transparency, are most clearly patent in the essence of ngowo[a] aspect of this awareness, in its nature or rangzhin[b] aspect, and in the first of the three forms of manifestation of its energy or thukje[c] aspect, which is dang[d] energy—which, as evidenced by the instructions telling practitioners to identify the energy or thukje aspect of the Base the moment immediately preceding the manifestation of thought, is often posited as the model for the energy aspect of awareness as a whole. In fact, although none of the phenomena of any of the modes of manifestation of the energy of nondual primordial awareness may be said to be this awareness or something separate and different from this awareness,[315] and although awareness cannot be said to have the characteristics of any of these modes of manifestation, we identify awareness with the semnyi in the sense of the Gnitiveness / motility depending on the organism, and view it as having the characteristics of dang energy—such as incorporeality, lack of concreteness, transparency, immateriality, boundlessness, not being perceived through the five senses, and constituting an internal dimension (the last of these being, as we have seen, a feature dang energy acquires after the emergence of tsel energy and in relation to it). Furthermore, after the manifestation of tsel energy and the delusory valuation-absolutization of the threefold thought-structure, the Gnitiveness and motility of the semnyi appear to be functions of the mental subject that is indissolubly associated to dualistic consciousness, which as we know is a phenomenon of dang energy. Since modern human beings in ordinary states of consciousness experience tsel energy exclusively as object[316] and therefore as lacking the Gnitiveness proper to awareness, the characteristics of tsel energy, such as potential opaqueness and tangibility, seem to be those of a "material world" different from awareness, whereas those of the mental subject, which are those of dang energy and of the semnyi, appear to be those of dualistic consciousness. Furthermore, since the mental subject that we experience as our soul or mind, through its inherent link with the semnyi, can so often control phenomena of dang energy other than itself merely by conceiving the intention and mentally producing the impulse to do so,[317] and since most of the time no other mental subject is able to control those phenomena,[318] we take the dimension of this energy to be a mind, understood as the sphere of awareness of the mental subject, and take this mental subject to be the owner and commander of this dimension. Finally, since the mental subject that we experience as our soul or mind, (1) seems to be the experiencer of the sensations of the organism of which the semnyi is the Gnitiveness and motility, and (2) has the power to control the phenomena of dang energy, to control through these the "winds" ruling over bodily motility, and to control through these the body of which the semnyi is the Gnitiveness and motility, which no other mental subject can control, we view the body as being part of the same dimension as the mental subject (i.e., as belonging to the "inner dimension"), and as being under the

---

[a] *ngo bo*.
[b] *rang bzhin*.
[c] *thugs rje*.
[d] *gdangs*.

latter's command and ownership. At any rate, it is now clear that Sartre was confusing consciousness with primordial nondual awareness and its dang energy when he referred to the "translucency of consciousness:" it was because at the time of quoting him I could not deviate from the ongoing argument in order to enter into the present discussion, that I limited myself to saying I preferred to speak of the "transparency of consciousness."

Thus in contrast with the internal dimension of dang energy that we take to be the domain of awareness and in particular with the mental subject that we experience as the source of awareness and as the master and owner of the internal dimension (which as we have seen is a manifestation of the semnyi or Gnitiveness depending on the organism), we experience the external dimension of tsel energy that Descartes took for a *res extensa* and in particular the phenomena of tsel energy other than our organism (which as such make up the chönyi) as a substantial reality *external to and different from awareness*. The reason for this is not only that, as noted above, we came to identify awareness with the characteristics of dang energy and the "internal dimension" constituted by this energy, but also that the mental subject linked to the semnyi does not automatically have power over manifestations of tsel energy other than the organism and making up the chönyi—which offer resistance to the mental subject (in the sense of Heidegger's "substantiality / in-itself") to a far greater degree than dang energy—and does not seem to automatically own them insofar as they lie in a public dimension shared by many sentient beings. However, as we have seen, just as dang energy and the semnyi, the phenomena of tsel energy making up the chönyi manifest in the nondual awareness / Self-*qua*-Base illustrated by the mirror—which (is) neither dual nor substantial—and there can be no doubt that it is not external to that awareness, for *we can only perceive what manifests in it*.[319] The Dzogchen teachings say with regard to tsel energy that it (is) a manifestation of primordial nondual awareness that arises as one aspect of what they call the play / display (rölpa[a]) of the energy of this awareness, as the latter's adornment (gyen[b]).[320]

At this point it is appropriate to remind the reader that all that was said above with regard to the manifestation, in the manner of reflections in a mirror, of (1) thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness with its subject-object duality, (2) the phenomenon of being, and (3) the illusion of substantiality, applies only in *samsara*. In fact, as we have seen, neither in the condition of the base-of-all wherein neither *samsara* nor *nirvana* are functioning, nor in the condition of *nirvana*, is there: (1) dualistic, thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness with its subject-object polarity, (2) phenomenon of being, or (3) illusion of substantiality. This is so because, since what I am referring to as primordial, spontaneous awareness is the chikshe kundröl[c] or inherently all-liberating single gnosis of the Dzogchen teachings, the reGnition (of) this awareness' own face amounts to the instant dissolution, like feathers entering fire, of the dualistic, directional structure of knowledge and action having subject and object as its two poles and the concomitant phenomenon of being, *and* of the illusion of in-itself or substantiality discussed above. Therefore, it is clear that *nirvana* could neither involve the illusion that a mental subject endowed with being is the doer of action, thinker of thought and perceiver of perception, nor feature the illusion that objects *are in themselves*—which is why, as we have repeatedly seen, it does not involve either being-for-Self (which cannot enter *nirvana,* for *nirvana* constitutes its

[a] *rol pa*.
[b] *rgyan*.
[c] *gcik shes kun grol*.

extinction) or what Sartre called being-in-itself and that I called being-that-is-in-itself-to-being-for-Self: the mental subject no longer manifests, and though the sensory continuum does continue to manifest, it is no longer experienced as *being* or as being *in itself*.

What, then, is the *being* of dualistic, thetic, positional consciousness? Of the two Sartrean definitions of the being of consciousness, let us consider the one I listed as (A), in the terms in which it was redefined in this volume: as nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional awareness (of) the illusory, incorporeal mental subject that, by becoming confused with the Gnitiveness and motility of primordial nondual awareness, seems to be a dualistic, thetic, positional consciousness of an object that this consciousness experiences as other with regard to itself and which it often experiences as being in-itself. To begin with, we have seen that Sartre was unaware that being is not inherent in the *given*, or that the phenomenon of being is a samsaric illusion; that dualistic, thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness is not inherent in the Self; and that dualistic, thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness is the result of the confusion of the illusory mental subject with Gnitiveness: he was not aware that both the phenomenon of being and dualistic, thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness (with its noetic and noematic poles) are delusive appearances that manifest in nondual awareness as a result of the delusory valuation-absolutization of the supersubtle conceptual directional structure called threefold thought-structure—or that all that the mental subject takes for its own intentions, cognitions, actions, etc., are in truth the play of the energy of nondual awareness. On the contrary, wrongly taking for granted that thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness was a true, uncompounded essent involving self-being, and that the nondual awareness (of) this consciousness *was a mode of being*, he asserted the being-of-consciousness to be consciousness-(of)-being.

Since we have acknowledged both dualistic consciousness and being to be baseless appearances that, due to the delusory valuation-absolutization of the threefold thought-structure, manifest in *samsara* and only in *samsara*, we must modify Sartre's definition and assert the being-of-consciousness to be nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional awareness (of) *being consciousness of object*. In fact, since being is no more than a delusive appearance, the being of consciousness can only be nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional awareness (of) dualistic consciousness as an *essent-that-is*. However, since dualistic consciousness is not an actual essent, but the delusive ascription of the Gnitiveness and motility of primordial nondual awareness to the mental subject, the being of consciousness is our delusive experience of *the mental subject as an essent that is*, in which the subject in question is taken for a dualistic consciousness possessing its own separate cognitive principle: it is this that *in this book* is referred to as being-for-Self. As we have seen, the delusory valuation-absolutization of the threefold thought-structure gives rise to the incorporeal mental subject corresponding to the noetic pole in the dualistic structure of consciousness and delusively appearing to be the source of noesis, by the same token endowing it with the delusive appearance of being—as a result of which it appears as subject *in* nondual awareness, seeming to be an individual, separate, autonomous *consciousness that is* (i.e., an individual, separate, autonomous consciousness endowed with being).

Furthermore, in Part I, chapter II of this book it was shown that the verbal particle *is* may be validly understood in two senses, which are: (1) that of self-being (*swabhava*) or absolute position, which is no more than a delusive appearance of inverted or incorrect relative truth (Skt. *mithyasamvritisatya*; Tib. logpai kundzob denpa[a]), and (2) that of

[a] *log pa'i kun rdzob bden pa*.

actuality or effectiveness, which belongs to what is called actual or correct relative truth (Skt., *tathyasamvritisatya*; Tib. yangdakpai kundzob denpa[a]) and to conventional truth (Skt. *vyavaharasatya*; Tib. thanyekyi denpa[b]). The appearance of the mental subject *as an essent that is* may be understood in the first sense insofar as deluded samsaric beings experience all essents as having self-being or, which is the same, as absolute position, and may also be understood in the second sense insofar as the appearance of the mental subject certainly does produce effects (when it is manifest passions arise and produce all the effects proper to passions, and when it is not manifest passions cannot arise; moreover, as we have seen, the mental subject is one indispensable pole of the impulse resulting in action, which has a considerable degree of control over thought, through it over "winds," through these over the voluntary muscles of the body, and through these over the physical world). This does *not* mean that only when understood in the first sense does the particle *is* refer to a delusion: as also shown in a previous chapter of this volume, the etymological meaning of the Sanskrit term *samvriti*, which is the one translated as "relative" (and which is a component of the term *tathyasamvritisatya* or "actual relative truth") is "obscuration to correctness" or "thoroughly confused," and hence relative truth, even when it is of the "actual" or "correct" type, is always untruth—and, in fact, *in truth* it is not the mental subject that produces effects, for ultimately all of its actions and all of the effects of these actions are the play of the *logos* or the play of the energy of the Self-*qua*-Base / nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional, nonreflexive awareness. To conclude, we have also seen that both senses of *samvriti* are mixed up in our experience as sentient beings, for whenever we apprehend an instance of being *qua* actuality, we apprehend it as self-being. (Also the being of objects is *being* both in the senses of the delusive appearance of self-being and—provided we are speaking of actual objects rather than imaginary, hallucinated or fantasized objects—of actuality and hence of conventional truth.)

Now I must sum up the definitive redefinition, for the purposes of this book, of: (1) the *soi* or Self that (is) the *true absolute* and that (is) *absolute wholeness and plenitude* and *absolute perfection*; (2) the being of the mental subject that seems to be the noetic pole of dualistic, thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness; and (3) the being of that which appears as object and which the mental subject experiences as being *in itself*. (It is important to keep in mind that elements [2] and [3] manifest only in *samsara* and are totally absent in *nirvana*.) These redefinitions may be expressed as follows:

<u>1) The Self</u>: In terms of the clarifications made above, now we can redefine the Self as the primordial condition of total plenitude and perfection (Tib. Dzogchen[c]), which cannot be said to be either physical or mental, individual or universal, but to which is inherent what I am calling nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional, nonreflexive awareness. Since it corresponds to the condition of Dzogchen, it may be explained in terms of the triad Base / Path / Fruit, and so we have:

(A) The Self-*qua*-Base, corresponding to the total plenitude and perfection known as Dzogchen-*qua*-Base.

[a] *yang dag pa'i kun rdzob bden pa*.
[b] *tha snyad kyi bden pa*.
[c] *rdzogs chen* or *rdzogs pa chen po*.

(B) The Self-*qua*-Path or *holon*-*qua*-Path, corresponding to Dzogchen-*qua*-Path, which, as we have seen, is the realization, while on the Path, of the above mentioned total plenitude and perfection (Dzogchen).

(C) The Self-*qua*-Fruit or *holon*-*qua*-Fruit, corresponding to the irreversible realization of total plenitude and perfection known as Dzogchen-*qua*-Fruit.

In what regards (A) the Self-*qua*-Base, since this is another name for Dzogchen-*qua*-Base, it is the undivided continuum of totality and plenitude the Dzogchen teachings illustrate by the mirror; therefore, all phenomena—including those we consider to be physical and those we regard as mental, objects and subjects—are manifestations of its energy aspect, which may be said to (be) their *prima materia*[321] and true condition.[322] In itself, it does not involve space, time or knowledge,[323] for these arise with being-for-Self, which is the mode of being involving *distance* (firstly, according to Sartre's expression it is at a distance from Self / itself; secondly, in terms of the view expressed here, all distances in what Sartre called being-in-itself are established by being-for-Self, and manifest only in the experience of this mode of being; thirdly, though space, time and knowledge may be said to appear *in* the Self insofar as all experiences of being-for-Self are appearances in the primordial mirror that is the Self, they belong to relative truth, and as such they are delusive, baseless appearances). Thus understood, the Self-*qua*-Base is not subject to the duality between the two modes of being that Sartre called being-in-itself and being-for-Self, and constitutes the wholeness and plenitude that is illusorily disrupted by the arising of these two modes of being—giving rise to the feeling of lack in relation to which *value* arises, insofar as we value whatever we mistakenly believe may fill the lack inherent in being-for-Self or whatever distracts our attention from it (experiences, possession of objects, attribution of value to ourselves by others and so on). Therefore, it (is) total plenitude and perfection *qua* Base—and yet this total plenitude and perfection is not always patent as such, for the Base can manifest the three functional possibilities listed in the Dzogchen teachings:

(Ai) *Samsara*, in which the Self involves nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional, nonreflexive awareness (of) dual, thetic, positional and sometimes reflexive consciousness featuring as its seemingly noetic pole the appearance of a mental subject that *is*, and as its noematic pole the objects that (especially in the case of tsel energy) are experienced as being *in themselves*. Insofar as the illusion of dualistic consciousness that manifests in this condition is unaware of the true condition of the Base, it involves *avidya* or marigpa[a] in the first of the senses these terms have in the threefold classification chosen here, and insofar as it experiences itself as a separate receiver of experience, doer of action, thinker of thought and so on, and objects as a self-existent reality, it involves the fully fledged delusion that subsumes the second and third senses the terms *avidya* or marigpa have in the threefold classification chosen here. It is clear by now that it is when the play of the energy of the Self-*qua*-Base gives rise to *samsara*, that the Path becomes necessary as the means to overcome the lack of plenitude and frustration, together with the selfishness and noxiousness, inherent in *samsara*—and hence that *samsara* is the condition for there being a Path.

(Aii) *Nirvana*, in which the Self's nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional, nonreflexive awareness does not involve dual, thetic, positional consciousness of objects, and in which the reGnition (of) the true condition of the Base has made this true condition

---

[a] *ma rig pa*.

patent. Since this reGnition (is) what the Dzogchen teachings call "all-liberating single gnosis" (chikshe kundröl[a]), whatever may manifest that in *samsara* would conceal the true condition of the Base, spontaneously liberates itself—and hence no type of *avidya* or marigpa can become established. This condition corresponds both to the Self-*qua*-Path and the Self-*qua*-Fruit that will be defined below; since what Sartre called *holon* is the Self as he understood it, yet conceived *qua* (unattainable) Fruit, having redefined the Self so that it corresponds to the condition of Dzogchen, having identified the *holon* with *nirvana*, and having asserted it not only to be possible but to be that which human life is *for* and that in relation to which it derives its meaning, we can distinguish between a *holon*-*qua*-Path, corresponding to the Self-*qua*-Path, and a *holon*-*qua*-Fruit, corresponding to the Self-*qua*-Fruit. Since in *nirvana* in general the subject / object, being-for-Self / being-that-is-in-itself-to-being-for-Self cleavage is not manifest, this condition is characterized by what a tradition linked to the *Kalachakra Tantra* calls Total Space-Time-Awareness,[b] in which, there being no *illusion* of a division and thus no relativity, there is no space, time or knowledge, and therefore the total plenitude (Dzogchen, with the emphasis on its primordial purity or katak[c] aspect) of the Self-*qua*-Base is fully patent. Since in this condition awareness is neither stilled nor hampered, when it definitively consolidates, the total perfection (Dzogchen, with the emphasis on its spontaneous perfection or lhundrub[d] aspect) of the Self-*qua*-Base is unhindered, and the motility of awareness, free and beyond dualistic, intentional action, manifests as a myriad of consummate, all-accomplishing spontaneous activities.

(Aiii) The neutral base-of-all, in which the Self manifests as neutral, inactive, dormant or passive nondual awareness involving a beclouding element of stupefaction (mongcha[e]) and hence involving the first sense of *avidya* or marigpa in the threefold classification chosen here, and in which there is no dualistic consciousness of object. Since in this condition the sufferings of *samsara* are not experienced, and since due to the absence of the subject-object duality and of the concomitant lack of plenitude and conflicts it may be taken to be *nirvana* itself, those who enter it may be tempted to take shelter in it. However, it does not involve either the definitive liberation from the shortcomings of *samsara* proper to both Hinayana and Mahayana *nirvana*, or the omniscience characteristic of Mahayana *nirvana*, and while one dwells in it one cannot either work toward liberation or Awakening or work for the benefit of beings; therefore, the Dzogchen teachings warn against dwelling in this condition, which they compare with cutting one's own head.

As noted above, (B) the Self-*qua*-Path or *holon*-*qua*-Path and (C) the Self-*qua*-Fruit or *holon*-*qua*-Fruit are the two ways in which the functional possibility of the Self-*qua*-Base listed as (Aii) can manifest:

(B) Is a *temporary* manifestation of supreme *nirvana* that at some point will be replaced by the condition of the base-of-all, which then will be succeeded by *samsara*. Though in it the Self-*qua*-Base is fully patent, the individual may *not have yet* acquired the capacity to carry out all activities consummately from this condition.

---

[a] *gcik shes kun grol*.
[b] Cf. Tarthang Tulku (1977a).
[c] *ka dag*.
[d] *lhun grub*.
[e] *rmongs cha*.

(C) Is definitive supreme *nirvana* corresponding to total, irreversible Buddhahood. Since delusion has been definitively eradicated, and with it the illusion of a separate self or ego and phenomena other than this self or ego has been done away with once and for all, selfishness no longer manifests that may become the cause for evil to arise, but by the same token other sentient beings that may become objects of compassion are no longer perceived. Likewise, since the subject-object duality has been eradicated, there is no way intentional action for the benefit of beings may manifest. This is why the all-accomplishing activities (Tib. thinle[a]) of the Buddhas, which fall as a shower of blessings over all sentient beings, arise spontaneously as the function of nonreferential compassion without there being a perception of sentient beings to be helped[324]—and do so utterly beyond action (Chinese, *wu-wei*), in the way the teachings call "action and fruit of action devoid of the threefold thought-structure" (Tib. khorsum nampar mitokpe ledang drebu[b]). In their turn, the reasons why these selfless activities manifest consummately are, one the one hand, that dualistic, intentional, fragmentary, reflexive consciousness and the dynamic of inverted effect or backwards dynamic[c][325]—and in particular the self-hindering—inherent in it are thoroughly eradicated on the occasion of attaining total, irreversible Buddhahood, so that awareness becomes all-embracing[326] and capacity unimpeded, and, on the other hand, that in this condition the end result of the learning done throughout the individual's lifetime—which includes the special type of learning achieved in the process of Awakening, which allows the individual to perfect skills far beyond the ordinary level—is at the disposal of the unimpeded capacity in question. In what concerns theoretical understanding, on the Path the operation in experience of the basic principles of the *dharma* is recurrently witnessed and so one's understanding of them, rather than being of the kind obtained from books, is first hand and indisputable. While on the Path, in the state of Contemplation, the "spontaneous, unimpeded reasoning arising in the patency of the *dharmata* [Tib., chönyikyi rigpa[d]]" manifests again and again—and then, once full Awakening has been attained, it manifests whenever necessary. Therefore, as the individual proceeds along the Path an unequalled grasp of *dharma* principles and an unobstructed intelligence are obtained that result in a wondrous understanding of all that has to do with the *dharma*, and often in knowledge of many things she or he never studied—and then on the occasion of full Awakening this grasp and understanding reach their zenith. (This is how Dzogchen Master Jigme Lingpa, who did not carry out formal studies, came to exhibit qualities that caused the most learned panditas to bestow on him the title kunkhyen[e], meaning "all-knower."[327]) In conclusion, in the Self-*qua*-Fruit / *holon-qua*-Fruit, which is totally and irreversibly beyond the duality of *samsara* and *nirvana*, spontaneous perfection (lhundrub[f]) manifests *qua* Fruit in unconceivable wondrous ways, as a limitless array of qualities and capacities.

<u>2) Being-for-Self</u>: As redefined here, being-for-Self is nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional and nonreflexive awareness (of) the *mental subject* which appears to be the noetic pole of a

---

[a] *phrin las*.
[b] *'khor gsum rnam par mi rtog pa'i las dang 'bras bu*.
[c] Watts (1959); Capriles (1990a, 2001, in press 3).
[d] *chos nyid kyi rigs pa* (*rigs pa* is not the same term as *rig pa*, for *rigs* means "reasoning").
[e] *kun mkhyen*.
[f] *lhun grub*.

dualistic, thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness (and which Descartes wrongly believed to be a substantial *res cogitans*) as *an essent that **is*** (in the twofold sense of the delusion of self-being [*swabhava*] or absolute position, and of actuality). Or, which is the same, it (is) nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional and nonreflexive awareness (of) the mental subject *as a separate, autonomous perceiver / doer / thinker that **is***. Therefore, being-for-Self is the delusive appearance that I have explained to be the *being of human consciousness*, and as such in our dimension it is manifest in its fully developed form only in deluded human essents—i.e. in that which Madhyamika philosophy calls "phenomena that are human beings" and Heidegger called human existent of *Dasein* (being-there).[328] As we have seen, this actual yet delusive appearance manifests when the delusory valuation-absolutization of the threefold thought-structure (which, as repeatedly noted, is the concept that there is a *subject that is,* an *object that is* and an *experience that is*) simultaneously gives rise to the *phenomenon of being* and the directional structure of knowledge and action I have been calling dual, thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness: it manifests as the seemingly noetic pole of this consciousness, which seems to be a *mental subject that is* and which, as we have seen, by assuming the Gnitiveness and motility of nondual awareness to be its own capacities, comes to appear to be the dualistic consciousness that Sartre called "thetic," and "positional," which is also often reflexive.

3) Being-that-is-in-itself-to-being-for-Self: As redefined here, what Sartre called being-in-itself, but which insofar as it is in-itself only in the delusive experience of being-for-Self I have renamed being-that-is-in-itself-to-being-for-Self, first manifests as our experience of what Descartes called *res extensa* as a *totality that is* (both in the sense of the delusion of self-being [*swabhava*] or absolute position, and in that of actuality) *and that is in itself*, and then manifests as our experience of that which Madhyamika philosophy calls "phenomena that are not human beings" and which Heidegger called available essents, as *essents that are* (both in the sense of the delusion of self-being [*swabhava*] or absolute position, and in that of actuality), *and that are in themselves*. Therefore, it may be defined as nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional, nonreflexive awareness (of) dual, thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness of what Descartes called *res extensa* as a *totality that **is*** and *that is **in itself***, and of available essents / phenomena that are not human beings as *essents that **are*** and that *are **in themselves***. As we have seen, this actual yet delusive appearance manifests when the delusory valuation-absolutization of the threefold thought-structure simultaneously gives rise to the *phenomenon of being* and the directional structure of knowledge and action I have been calling dual, thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness, and tsel energy seems to make resistance to it, to have already been there, and so on: it manifests as the seemingly noematic pole of this consciousness, which seems to be an *object that is*—and, in particular in the case of tsel energy, to be *in-itself,* for being-for-Self experiences it as offering resistance to it, as being substantial, etc.

To use the term "self" in a Buddhist-inspired philosophical system may seem to be contradictory insofar as one of the most basic concepts of Buddhism is that of *anatman* or dagme[a]. However, the fact that I refer to the condition of Dzogchen by the name "Self" does not mean that this condition corresponds to the concept represented by this word: the concept of self could not correspond to the condition of Dzogchen, for that concept has its

[a] *bdag med*.

differentia specifica in the concept of other, whereas the condition in question does not exclude anything and hence can have neither *genus proximum* nor *differentia specifica*. Therefore, the use of this term for referring to the condition of Dzogchen violates the logic of language—and, in fact, it is in order to indicate that what I am referring to by the term does not correspond to the concept of "self," that I capitalize it, writing it as "Self." This is the same that, as shown in a previous chapter, would happen if we understood the Self in terms of any of the four extremes consisting in nonbeing, not-nonbeing, both-being-and-nonbeing, and neither-being-nor-nonbeing. However, the reason why in throughout this volume I took so many pains to dissociate the concept of *being* from what in the Dzogchen teachings refer to as the Base, is that those who have used the former to refer to the latter never notified their readers that the two could not correspond, and, on the contrary, in some cases asserted the Base to be the same as Heidegger's *das Sein*. On the contrary, when using the concept of Self to refer to the condition called Dzogchen not only have I capitalized it and explained the reasons for this, but I have taken the care of redefining Sartre's concept in very precise terms.

Furthermore, if (contrarily to Chandrakirti's belief) the Self may not be understood in terms of the concept of being, (also contrarily to Chandrakirti's belief) far less could it be said to involve self-being—and therefore the majority of the most consistent exponents of Madhyamika philosophy would assert it to be characterized by emptiness of self-being (Skt. *swabhava shunyata*; Tib. rangzhinggyi tongpanyi[a]).[329] For the same reasons, and also because what I am calling Self is not a soul, "I" or self, either individual or universal, Buddhism would categorize it as being selfless (Skt. *anatman*; Tib. gangzaggi dagme[b]).[330] However, insofar as "selfless" is also a concept defined in terms of a *differentia specifica*—which lies in the concept of self—it is just as inadequate as the term "self" to refer to that which does not exclude anything: when applied to the Self, the concept of *anatman* or gangzaggi dagme, *rather* than making the point that it *is a nonself*, merely makes the point that it [*is*] *not a self*.

For the same reasons why I capitalize the term "self" to refer to what here I call the Self—i.e., so that it will not be confused with what is ordinarily referred to by the word—Buddhist vehicles that use the term, in general qualify it by an adjective. Nubchen Sangye Yeshe[c] tells us in his *Samten Migdrön*[d] that dagnyi chenpo,[e] which is often translated as "total Selfhood" but which has the meaning of "true nature of Self that is total [in that there is nothing external to it]",[331] is a fundamental concept in Buddhist Mahayoga[f] that makes the point that there is nothing external to what we are in truth. The same term is used in the Semde[g] series of Buddhist Dzogchen teachings to refer to the Base, or to the condition of Dzogchen with its three aspects of Base, Path and Fruit.[h] And yet sometimes the Buddhist

[a] *rang bzhing gyis stong pa nyid*.
[b] *gang zag gi bdag med*.
[c] *gnubs chen sangs rgyas ye shes*.
[d] *bsam gtan mig sgron*.
[e] *bdag nyid chen po*.
[f] Cf. Namkhai Norbu & Clemente (1999), p. 279, note 197.
[g] *sems sde*.
[h] Cf. Namkhai Norbu & Clemente (1999), p. 274, note 135; Namkhai Norbu (unpublished ms.); Capriles (2000a).

Dzogchen teachings use the term "Self" or "I" without qualifying it by an adjective; suffice to quote the way yogis express their realization of the practice in *The Realization of Yoga*:[a]

Great Master, we See the I.[b]

To conclude with the subject of this section, since Sartre rejected the possibility of attaining a condition of totality and wholeness like the one he called *holon* (by implication rejecting the possibility of Awakening and thereby implicitly rejecting Buddhism and all Paths of Awakening), one can but wander what may have led him to conceive the human reality as being-for a condition of totality and wholeness that upon being projected beyond this world and being conceived in anthropomorphic, egomorphic terms becomes the God of the great monotheistic religions (and which, as just noted, is perennially out of the reach of human beings). T. Riedlinger[c] explained the "pessimistic" philosophy of the "first Sartre" in general as the result of a "bad" psychedelic experience.[332] Though there is no way to *prove* Riedlinger's interpretation to be right or wrong, and this is not the moment for discussing the correctness or incorrectness of the Grofian categories he uses, it is a fact that Sartre acknowledged in one of his writings to have experimented with Mescaline.[d] Since psychedelics tend to widen the focus of conscious awareness, under their effect it is likely that an individual may have the intuition of a totality in which he or she tends to fuse, yet is prevented from fusing with it by the terror of fusing in totality, disappearing as a seemingly separate essent and coming to realize the insubstantiality of all essents, which I call *pan*ic (a term that, as noted in a previous chapter of this volume, derives from Pan, the early Greek god who represents totality and whose name means "totality"[333]), and which often involves dread of death and/or horror of madness. In such a case it does not seem unlikely that the individual may develop a conception of the human reality like the one Sartre expressed in *Being and Nothingness*, in which being-for-Self is *being-for-a-condition-of-totality-and-wholeness* and yet by each and every one of its acts it affirms itself in order not to "fuse" with it. However, the same conception is naturally derived from Awakening—with the only difference that in this case it would involve the assertion that being-for-Self *can* and *must* dissolve in Awakening.

Being-for-Self as Unhappy Consciousness

As we have seen, the arising of being-for-Self, involving the illusion that one *is* a mental subject (i.e. an incorporeal thinker-perceiver-doer) at a distance from the rest of the Self-*qua*-Base, and the illusion that the Gnitiveness and motility of nondual awareness are capacities of this subject, gives rise to the illusory disruption of the continuum of plenitude that the Self-*qua*-Base (is), as a result of which the illusory dualistic, thetic, positional consciousness with a rather hermetic focus of conscious awareness is haunted by a lack of plenitude, and the whole life of the individual becomes a struggle aimed at overcoming this lack of plenitude. However, this struggle cannot put an end to the lack of plenitude inherent in the appearance of *being* a mental subject at a distance from the rest of the Self-*qua*-Base, for the dynamic of relative truth (which as we have seen is delusion and untruth) is such

---

[a] *rnal 'byor grub pa'i lung*.
[b] *bdag gis mthong lags so*.
[c] Riedlinger (1982); Grof (1985, 1986). In 1986, Grof attributes an earlier date to Riedlinger's paper.
[d] Sartre (1940).

that all of the mental subject's actions affirm and sustain its own existence—which it finds highly reassuring and which, paradoxically, it secretly intends and desires, for its worst fears are those concerning the possibility of its own dissolution.

What the *Book of Genesis* called the "Fall" and presented as a result of "eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil," corresponds to the functional possibility of the Self-*qua*-Base called *samsara*, and as such consists in the *seeming* disruption of the Self by the arising of the duality being-for-Self / being-that-is-in-itself-to-being-for-Self, and the frustrating dynamic ensuing from this.[334] Knowledge of good and evil is judgment, which in German is *Urteil*, the etymological meaning of which is "originary partition:" in order to judge, first of all there has to arise the spurious subject-object duality; then the continuum of what appears as object is illusorily divided into figure and ground; judgment causes the figure to be understood in terms of the content of a thought.[335] As shown in the first chapter of Part I of this book, in the case of judgments of taste (including the aesthetic judgments Kant placed in a special category and wrongly deemed to be always *a priori*), moral judgments and so on, the object is accepted or rejected. As shown in a previous chapter of this volume, since consciousness can have only one attitude at a time toward its object and this attitude embraces the whole of the sensory continuum, insofar as pleasant sensations are those that are accepted, unpleasant sensations are those that are rejected and neutral ones are those we remain indifferent to, the "mental sensation" (Skt. *vedana*; Tib. tsorwa[a]) that arises in the middle of the chest at the level of the heart on the occasion of the manifestation of thoughts and perceptions (which, when delusory valuation-absolutization is more intense, manifest as passions), is pleasant when the object is accepted, unpleasant when the object is rejected, and neutral when we remain indifferent to it. Furthermore, we automatically believe this sensation to be the measure of the object's objective beauty or ugliness, goodness or wickedness, etc., and therefore it confirms our delusive perception of objectiveness.

The Fall is at the root of the sufferings of *samsara*, not only because it is at the root of the recurrence of unpleasant sensations—which are themselves suffering, or, to express it in terms of Shantideva's three types of suffering, are instances of *suffering of suffering*—but also because it is at the root of the recurrence of pleasant sensations which, insofar as they are fleeting, shortly give way to unpleasant or neutral sensations, and hence give rise to what Shantideva called *suffering of change*—and, moreover, because underlying them is the lack of plenitude and sense of missing the point inherent in the illusory rupture of the absolute wholeness and concomitant plenitude of the Self, which Shantideva called *all-pervasive suffering*.[b] However, this Fall may not be reduced to an occurrence that took place, once and for all, thousands of years ago, for it occurs in human experience each and every time being-for-Self and being-that-is-in-itself-to-being-for-Self arise from the neutral condition of the base-of-all in which neither *samsara* nor *nirvana* are active, as a first step in the development of *samsara*.[336] As we have seen, when the illusory mental subject arises as a result of the delusory valuation-absolutization of the threefold thought structure, and it assimilates the Gnitiveness and motility of nondual awareness, seeming to be a separate, autonomous dualistic, thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness, the deceptive appearance of a rupture of the absolute wholeness, sameness and nonduality of the Self's Total Space-

[a] *tshor ba*.
[b] For a more in-depth explanation of these three see the upcoming revised version (to appear in print) of Capriles (2003).

Time-Awareness arises that causes this illusory separate consciousness to miss the absolute plenitude of this Self—which is the reason why the existence of the illusory mental subject is the source of the lack of plenitude and lack of value that haunts all beings in *samsara* and which is the third of the types of suffering described by Shantideva. In fact, this illusory mental subject *is itself* the illusion of a gap, a hollow, *nothingness* or *nonbeing* in the very middle of the absolute plenitude of the Self-*qua*-Base—which, insofar as the threefold thought-structure involves the concept of being, as soon as the delusory valuation-absolutization of this thought-structure produces the illusory subject-object duality, in contrast with the gap, hollow, *nothingness* or *nonbeing* that the illusory mental subject is, becomes *being* and acquires the mode of being that is in-itself to being-for-Self. However, insofar as the gap, hollow, *nothingness* or *nonbeing* that the mental subject is, seems to *be*, and with each of its acts it affirms itself as *being*, it *has its being*—which is the mode of being here called being-for-Self.

The mental subject of which being-for-Self is the *being*, to which all that is spatial *presents* itself, as implied by Plato's etymological definition of the term *presence* (which, Heidegger reminded us, is that of *being in face of*—and as such implies *being at a distance from*)[337] seems to be *at a distance* from what we experience as the "physical world"—i.e., from what Einstein explained as a continuous, single energy field, and Descartes conceived as a *res extensa* involving self-being—and hence from all the segments of that "physical world" that human perception may take as figure and experience as essents. In the spatial plane, the *illusion* of a gap, hollow, *nothingness* or *nonbeing* that the mental subject (is),[338] corresponds to the crossing point of the lines representing the three spatial dimensions. Since these lines, and therefore also the point at which they cross, rather than physical are *mathematical*, the mental subject does not occupy any space (this being the reason why René Descartes could conceive this subject in the terms in which he conceived the *res cogitans*); furthermore, insofar as the mental subject is one of the poles of the threefold thought structure, if we assume that thoughts have no mass, we will be assuming that the mental subject has no mass. Since something occupying no space and having no mass has no *physical* existence whatsoever, on the basis of this premise we would have to conclude that from the *physical* perspective the mental subject is *nothing at all*. Dualistic, thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness, insofar as it seems to be a capacity of the mental subject manifesting as its seemingly noetic pole, seems to act and perceive from the point this subject occupies, thus experiencing itself as being at a distance from the absolute plenitude of the Self, which from the spatial standpoint may be viewed as total, undivided Space—but which upon the manifestation of the dichotomy of being-for-Self / being-that-is-in-itself-to-being-for-Self appears to be a *physical* continuum and to *be in-itself* or *be substantial* (in the sense in which Heidegger used these terms in the passage cited in a previous chapter of this volume). And, insofar as this consciousness experiences itself as lying at a distance from the plenitude of the continuum that the Self (is) and that is its true condition, it suffers the experience of lack of the total plenitude of the Self. It is significant that, although in our experience through the senses the continuum of space appears to involve discontinuities and divisions, physical theories in the last one hundred years conceive spatial "physical reality" as a continuum without gaps, hollows, divisions or separations (examples of this being Einstein's Field Theory, and even more so those subsequent theories unifying all fundamental forces), and in some cases go even farther and assert space to arise from a more basic, non-dimensional reality (examples of this being David Bohm's Holonomic Theory, and Recognition Physics in general)—which

means that scientific research aimed at determining the true condition of what we call *physical* reality, but which is in truth the Self, has resulted in a conception of what we call *physical* reality in terms of characteristics of the Self such as wholeness and continuity.[339] At any rate, when the illusion of being at a distance from what we call *physical* reality and in general all that may appear as object dissolves, space is no longer space and only the condition of absolute plenitude that the Self (is) manifests.

The mental subject of which being-for-Self is the being, which from the standpoint of the time dimension seems to be in the *present* moment that separates the past from the future but that does not have any duration whatsoever, as implied by the Platonic sense of the term *present* discussed above, seems to be *at a distance* from the absolute plenitude of the Self, which from the perspective of time is the undivided *now* that I have been calling total Time. In fact, here I will use the term *now* to refer to the Self from this perspective, or, which is the same, to total Time, which insofar as it does not involve a separation of future and past, (is) absolute plenitude. On the contrary, I will use the term *present* to refer to the illusion of a gap, hollow, *nothingness* or *nonbeing* in the time continuum, consisting in the *mathematical instant* (the instant having no duration whatsoever) that seems to separate the future from the past, illusorily dividing the undivided *now*—so that the *present* will be the instant in which the mental subject corresponding to the seemingly noetic pole of dualistic, thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness appears to lie, and which insofar as it illusorily disrupts the undivided *now*, causes the consciousness of which the mental subject is the seemingly noetic pole to miss the plenitude of this undivided *now*. In brief, in the temporal plane I use the term *present* to refer to the core of our illusory separation from the Self that (is) our own condition of total plenitude, and therefore to the source of the experience of lack of this plenitude, and I use the term *now* to refer to the undivided, total Time that is realized when we cease experiencing ourselves as a mental subject lying in the *present*—on the occasion of which time as such dissolves and we realize the absolute plenitude of the Self.

Thus in terms of space-time the illusion of a gap, a hollow, *nothingness* or *nonbeing* that being-for-Self is, corresponds to the crossing point of *four* mathematical lines: the three lines representing the spatial dimensions, and the line illustrating the time dimension. It is precisely in this point that the illusory, apparently separate mental subject of which being-for-Self is the being seems to be located: this point is its place and moment. Being mathematical rather than physical, this crossing point does not occupy any space or time, and yet, as the center of all experienced space and time, it is the necessary reference that allows all spatiotemporal perceptions to occur. However, the reason why the mental subject does not occupy any extension in space or time is *not* that, as Descartes wrongly believed, it is an immaterial, undying self-existent soul, but that, as we have seen, *it is one of the poles of the supersubtle threefold thought-structure*, and thoughts are phenomena of the dang[a] mode of manifestation of energy, which do not occupy any space whatsoever—and which, unlike Descartes' *res cogitans*, rather than being undying, self-existent phenomena, are delusive, baseless samsaric appearances that, on the occasion of reGnizing their true condition, instantly dissolve leaving no traces. Now one further reason for asserting the gap, hollow, *nothingness* or *nonbeing* that the mental subject *is* to be illusory should be clear: in the modern sense of the term, in order to be *real*, the mental subject would have to be *physical*—which implies that, rather than being merely a thought that has been

[a] *gdangs*.

delusorily valued, it would have to be an essent occupying an extension in space and time, or, at least (like the quark, which is supposed not to occupy any space), having a mass.[340] Since, as established above and as reflected by the Platonic definition of the terms *presence* and *present*, the illusory gap, hollow, *nothingness* or *nonbeing* that illusory disrupts Total Space-Time-Awareness, in the plane of temporality manifests as the *present* that illusorily separates the future from the past, while in the plane of spatiality manifests as the illusion of *presence* of the physical world and hence of *being at a distance from* the physical world, I only use the terms *present* and *presence* when referring to *samsara*, which alone involves the illusion of being at a distance from both the *now* and the physical universe. However, in some cases I use the term Presence, written with a capital in order to indicate that I am using it in a sense that does not respond to its etymology, to refer to the state the Dzogchen teachings call rigpa[a], which is the most thorough manifestation of *nirvana*, so to speak. (It must be noted that the mental subject of which being-for-Self is the being, also has the illusion of being at a distance from the "other mental subjects" that again and again force it to *become* the person they perceive as object, and thereby to experience itself as object.)[341]

Above, I showed the three types of suffering posited by Madhyamika Prasangika philosopher Shantideva to be inherent in being-for-Self, and explained the way in which this mode of being gives rise to one of the most significant manifestations of all-pervasive suffering—namely the lack of plenitude that we feel compelled to fill by a plethora of self-frustrating means—yet I disregarded other quite important manifestations of this type of suffering, such as the unremitting anxiety and the lack of existential meaning that, having reached their pinnacle, have become signs of our time. With regard to the former, since being-for-Self cannot determine its experiences, its temporal existence implies that at any moment it may have to meet painful sensations and situations—and, in particular, that sooner or later the organism through which being-for-Self experiences, that it repeatedly *becomes* in the experience of being-for-others,[342] and with which it routinely identifies, will meet death. Furthermore, *the actions of being-for-Self* themselves may at any time give rise to painful sensations and situations, and even result in the death of the organism linked to this mode of being. Likewise, in most individuals being-for-Self cannot bear awareness of its own insubstantiality, or of that of the rest of the phenomena of experience. Because of these and other facts, this mode of being implies the *Angst* Kierkegaard described in his writings,[b] the *Angst* and uneasiness inherent in what Heidegger[c] called being toward the end, the *angoise* that Sartre[d] explained as *fear of freedom* (as such related to Kierkegaard's *Angst*[343]), and, furthermore, the dread of these painful experiences themselves—all of which we feel compelled to elude by means that are discussed in the following chapter, whereby we turn them into the unremitting anxiety that has become ubiquitous among city dwellers, and that we can neither bring to an end, nor fully suppress or elude. Likewise, being-for-Self implies the sense of lack of existential meaning inherent in what Heidegger called *thrownness*[e]—i.e., in the state of being *thrown*[f]—and in general in feeling separate from the flow of experience, which causes us to sense that all that comes with this flow is imposed on us by an external power, and to question ourselves why are we alive in this

[a] *rig pa*.
[b] Kierkegaard (1968, 1970).
[c] Heidegger (1996).
[d] Sartre (1980).
[e] German, *Geworfenheit*.
[f] German, *Geworfen*.

world, why do occurrences happen, what is the purpose of human existence, and so on—all of which Sartre subsumed by saying we are *de trop*.[344] This gives rise to the imperative of inventing or adopting myths, beliefs and ideologies susceptible of endowing our lives with an illusion of meaning, which in our time has become a source of conflict, for on the one hand the modern scientific mentality and the knowledge of religious beliefs and ideologies of cultures different from our own has impaired our willingness to adhere to the traditional myths of our society, while on the other hand the collision of the train-like illusion of progress against the wall-like reality of ecological crisis has seriously undermined our disposition to adhere to the alternative myths of modernity—and so we find it impossible to cling to either traditional or modern myths from we may derive meaning, which has given rise to a general climate of nihilism and despair, in the sense of Nietzsche's second stage of nihilism, "radical nihilism."[345] Finally, it is relevant to consider the boredom we experience whenever we are left alone without distractions, even though properly speaking this boredom is not an instance of all-pervasive suffering, but a result of our reactions to particular situations: the unpleasant sensations associated with what we call boredom result from our rejection of the steadiness of the neutral sensations we experience before the lack of sizable change (for, as we have seen, sensations become unpleasant when they are rejected), and as soon as boredom arises we feel compelled to elude it by seeking change and distractions. I nonetheless include boredom in this paragraph because it is an effect of being-for-Self that works on human beings in a similar way as the various signs and instances of all-pervasive suffering.

As suggested above, there is a duplicity in the mental subject of which being-for-Self is the being, for on the one hand, as we have seen, it consists in the illusion of a gap, hollow, *nothingness* or *nonbeing* in the midst of the Self, and as such in a negativity, but on the other hand, insofar as being-for-Self is nondual awareness (of) the mental subject as an essent that *is*, this mental subject is a positivity: it is an *existent*, which by each of its acts affirms itself as *being*, and which *is compelled* to maintain the illusion of its own existence by constantly affirming itself as such.[346] In fact, the experience of the illusory nothingness or gap at the crossing point of the lines of the four dimensions as though it were a separate mental subject implies the impulse to affirm this subject as *being* that, as noted in a previous chapter, the Dzogchen teachings call *ahamkara* or ngadzin[a]—a term that has the etymological meaning of "self-grasping," but which denotes a complex idea that involves self-affirmation and self-preoccupation—and that is hardly distinguishable from the second of the three types of the craving or thirst called *trishna*, which is the one called *bhava-trishna* or thirst-for-existence, consisting in the compulsion to assert, confirm and maintain oneself as an absolutely existent, important, separate individual. The duplicity in question is the core of the contradiction inherent in being-for-Self, which lies in the fact that the only way to surpass the lack of plenitude and the rest of the flaws inherent in this mode of being is through the extinction of being-for-Self, yet this is out of the question due to the mental subject's compulsive self-affirmation (which as we have seen is inherent in what I am rendering literally as self-grasping), which the morbid learning achieved in the process of socialization compounds into what Aldous Huxley called the "Essential Horror:" dread of the dissolution of being-for-Self as though it were the worst imaginable catastrophe. Hence the operative contradiction inherent in being-for-Self, consisting in the fact that we

[a] *nga 'dzin*.

try to overcome the unpleasant effects of this mode of being by means that affirm and maintain the mode of being in question, thereby sustaining the effects we try to overcome.

For example, we try to overcome the sensation of lack by means that affirm and sustain our illusion of being the mental subject *qua* an inherently separate entity, which is the source of our lack of plenitude. Likewise, our very craving to eradicate or elude the anxiety inherent in being-for-Self affirms and sustains this mode of being and therefore the anxiety inherent in it—and, moreover, it elicits anxiety with regard to the presence of anxiety, multiplying the anxiety we strive to eradicate or elude. Similarly, our compulsion to endow our lives with meaning sustains being-for-Self, which is the veil precluding awareness of the nonconceptual Meaning inherent in the nondual flow of Gnitiveness. In turn, our drive to do away with boredom, insofar as it implies the rejection of this experience, merely increases the rejection of experience at the root of the unpleasantness inherent in what we call boredom, which we strive to eradicate. Furthermore, after we realize the defects of *samsara* and the fact that their root is being-for-Self, coming to yearn for the dissolution in *nirvana* of being-for-Self with all of its shortcomings, this very yearning, which is the modification of *trishna* (the thirst or craving that according to the Hinayana is the Second Noble Truth) called *vibhava-trishna*, in agreement with our most secret wishes affirms and sustain being-for-Self—this being the reason why higher forms of Buddhism emphasize the need to go beyond fear of *samsara* and desire for *nirvana*. Likewise, when we actually set on the spiritual Path, our practice of spiritual methods based on *production* gives rise to results that are produced / caused (Pali *bhèta*; Skt. *nutpada* or *nutpatti*; Tib. kyepa[a]), born (Pali and Skt. *jata*; Tib. kyepa[b]), or compounded / conditioned / constructed / made / contrived / fabricated (Pali, *sankhata*; Skt. *samskrita*; Tib. düjai[c]), sustaining *samsara*. In their turn, spiritual practices based on *action* affirm and sustain the doer of action of which being-for-Self is the being—this being the reason why the direct Path to Awakening is that of Dzogchen *Atiyoga*, which is beyond action and therefore beyond cause and effect. The self-frustrating patterns discussed in this paragraph are all instances of the paradoxical dynamic of *samsara* Alan Watts subsumed under the label "law of inverted effect" or "backward law,"[d] which in two previous works I amply illustrated in poem-like ways.[e]

It is insofar as we believe that the possession of essents, the conquest of love or the attainment of rank or power will allow us to surpass the lack of plenitude and existential meaning inherent in being-for-Self, or that the execution of activities, attendance to events, performances and so on will distract our attention from this lack of plenitude and meaning, as well as from the anxiety, the recurrent boredom and the rest of the shortcomings inherent in being-for-Self, that we prize possessions, love, rank, power, activities and distractions, endowing them with *value*. For example, we endow with value those objects we believe to have the power of providing pleasure, comfort or fulfillment, with which we attempt to fill the lack of plenitude and elude the anxiety inherent in being-for-Self. We also endow with value those objects we believe to have the power of endowing our lives with meaning (and in particular those our social group values and attaches meaning to, for

---

[a] *skyes pa*.
[b] *skyes pa*.
[c] *'dus byas*.
[d] Watts (1959); Capriles (1990a, 2001, in press 3).
[e] Capriles (1990a, 2001).

we believe that coming to possess them will lead other members of the group to project that value and meaning on us). Likewise, we endow with value the objects we believe to have the power of providing distraction with regard to the lack of plenitude and meaning, the anxiety, the recurrent boredom and the rest of the shortcomings inherent in being-for-Self. (Etc.) In fact, it is in this way that we give rise to what Heidegger called *wertverhaftete Dinge* or *value-endowed things*.

A strong erotic-spiritual attraction to a given individual may cause our organism to secrete huge amounts of endorphins (endogenous molecules having a structure similar to that of opiates[347]), causing us to experience the kind of special feeling which we call "falling in love," which we take as an objective evidence of the uniqueness and specialty of that individual. However, the "high" obtained thereby does not last long: it has been determined that in the best of cases the extraordinary production of endorphins associated with falling in love may last up to three years. Furthermore, we strive to conquer the love of the person that seemed special to us, not only because we want the endorphin-induced rush to fill our lack of plenitude and help us elude in a continuous way the anxiety and other shortcomings inherent in being-for-Self, but also because *we want to be valued* in order to fill our lack of plenitude with the received value, and because to the extent that we value a person we can value the value that, if we conquer her or his love, she or he will project on us—and so we hope to use that person as a magic mirror like the one in the tale of *Snow White*. Likewise, if we manage to conquer the person's love to such an extent that she or he makes us believe that we are the justification and source of meaning of her or his existence, we will be able to derive meaning from providing meaning to the existence of a valued other. However, needing another to project value on us in order to feel valuable and having to give meaning to the life of another in order to obtain a sense of existential meaning merely confirms and sustains our sense of insignificance, worthlessness and meaninglessness. Similarly, as in the case of the evil witch in the fairy tale, depending on someone to serve as a magic mirror leaves ourselves at her or his mercy; insofar as any time the individual on whom we have come to depend could cease valuing us more than anyone else, this furthers the anxiety we intended to avoid—in particular because, as Marcel Proust showed in *La prisonnière*, there is no way to penetrate the other's consciousness in order to make sure that we are still the most valued person and the source of existential meaning for her or him.[348]

Awareness of the above shortcomings and/or particular personal conditions lead some of us to strive to obtain fame and rank in order to conquer the admiration and love of as many magic mirrors as possible so as not to depend on one mirror that may suddenly prize another's reflection more than our own, and in order to better gain the illusion that the value projected on us is objective (the latter partly because in order to obtain fame and rank we have to be special in some sense or good at some activity, partly because we generally believe many mirrors have less probabilities of being wrong than a single mirror, partly because of the idea that if we depend on many mirrors we will not be so much affected by the potential volubleness of one of them). However, even if we get the right others to project value on us and for some time we receive the projections we want from those from whom we want them, there will be an underlying awareness that we are striving to obtain the illusion of value and meaning because at the very bottom we feel empty, worthless and meaningless, and so this will further our lack of value and meaning. Moreover, just as lovers often lose the love of the beloved, celebrities often sink back into obscurity, and so depending on the admiration of fans puts celebrities at their mercy—furthering anxiety in

so far as they may lose their popularity and be ignored, or become an object of spite.[349] Similar results are obtained from trying to be valued through associating with individuals many people value, through belonging to groups that many value, and so on.[350] At any rate, we have already seen that *samsara* involves all-pervasive suffering, and so no matter what we *qua* being-for-Self may experience, the lack of plenitude and meaning, the anxiety, and all the flaws inherent in the illusory experience of being at a distance from the Self will underlie it, preventing the experience from providing real fulfillment.

The above are "micro" and "macro" varieties of the project of the lover that Sartre analyzed in depth;[a] however, they are not the only ways whereby we might try to obtain value and meaning through others. Less sophisticated individuals having faced situations resulting in the maturing of karmic propensities different from those of Sartre's lover, may set out to derive value from submitting others and derive meaning from controlling them, in the bid for becoming the "master" that Hegel considered in his discussion of what he thought to be the genesis of self-consciousness.[b] At any rate, all of us value pursuits that, by absorbing our attention and / or by endowing our lives with the illusion of meaning, allow us to elude the lack of plenitude and meaning, the anxiety and the recurrent boredom inherent in being-for-Self. As Pascal made it clear, this is what makes hunters hunt, gamblers gamble, soldiers willingly go to war, and so on. However, such activities require self-deceit, for in order to pursue the game, the hunter has to believe he or she is after the game, rather than after the excitement and the illusion of meaning derived from going after the game; in order to gamble, the gambler has to believe that he or she wants the prize, rather than the excitement and the illusion of meaning derived from going after the prize; etc.

Furthermore, some of the activities we carry out in order to elude or appease the essential sensation of lack of plenitude and meaning, and the anxiety and boredom inherent in being-for-Self—for example, lovemaking or eating sophisticated dishes—directly give rise to sensual pleasure. In these cases we don't need to deceive ourselves concerning the object of our pursuit, for in general what we value is the pleasure we try to obtain and, in the case of lovemaking, often the satisfaction of satisfying the other as well (there being exceptions to this, for playboys may also be wanting to obtain value from being known to have a host of attractive sexual partners, and/or from being known to be the lover of a famous sex bomb or another celebrity; women who make themselves frigid may be aiming to frustrate their partner's wish to get the satisfaction of satisfying them;[c] snobs may be intending to be known to have enough money and good taste as to set out to enjoy the most sophisticated delicacies; etc.). However, we have seen that being in the *present* implies missing the absolute plenitude inherent in the undisrupted *now*; when in this *now* there manifests the sensation deluded beings interpret as erotic pleasure and accept, by being in the *present* we miss both the absolute plenitude inherent in the *now* and the full feeling of the erotic sensation that in a nondual condition would have served as an inconceivable adornment to this absolute plenitude. This leads us to crave for a more intense pleasure and chase after it, thereby keeping it away and reaping disappointment. In fact, at each stage of lovemaking there manifests a new, more intense degree of pleasure, which we cannot fully experience because of our being in the *present* and thus outside the *now*, and to which we

[a] Sartre (1980), III 1, pp. 431-447.
[b] Hegel (1955), B IV A.
[c] Laing (1961), chapter VI.

immediately get used, dismissing it and thus becoming indifferent to it—which makes the sensation become neutral, causing us to hunger for a more intense pleasure. Thus at each and every moment we miss the potential of the erotic sensation by becoming indifferent to it and by ignoring it through hungrily looking toward an imaginary future pleasure—as a result of which we miss the uninterrupted *crescendo* of sensation that lovemaking could be. This process goes on until climax, which somehow eludes us insofar as we are in the *present*—which, as just explained, involves a disruption of the *now* in which sensation manifests, causing it to be experienced in a very shallow way. Furthermore, when the fleeting moment of climax arrives, the attitude of looking toward the future and away from the *now* is so firmly established that the sensation becomes to us all the more shallow and short-lived, and our frenzied attempts to grasp it make it slip like sand through our fist.[351] Augustine of Hippo[352] said that after coitus all animals are sad; whether or not this is true, after intercourse human animals may experience frustration, and at any rate they are immediately forced to face again their lack of plenitude, anxiety and so on—which they may attempt to elude by inventing another pleasure to look toward, or another new activity that may allow them to look away from *duhkha*.

Thus it is clear that, as shown above, being-for-Self involves a duplicity insofar as it is on the one hand (1) a *nothingness* (insofar as the mental subject does not occupy any time or space and has no mass, but also because of the various other reasons discussed in this volume) that experiences a sensation of lack as the result of feeling separate from the absolute wholeness and uniform plenitude of the continuum of the Base (wherein, as the concept of "continuum" makes it clear, there are no empty spaces and no divisions), and on the other hand (2) the *being* of the mental subject, which is experienced as a positive, active *existent* that struggles with other existents and essents so as to maintain the continuity of its existence. Thus being-for-Self may be said to be at the same time *being* and *nothingness*; to be the being that *is* in the manner of *being nothing*; and to be the *nothingness* that affirms itself as *being*. (Sartre[a] gave many other explanations of nonbeing with regard to being-for-Self; some of those with which to some extent I agree were quoted above; however, many of his definitions have to do with the nihilating power he attributed to the dualistic consciousness *cum* mental subject that he subsumed under the concept of being-for-Self, but which in truth is inherent in primordial awareness. It was in order to undo the confusion consisting in viewing the consciousness-*cum*-mental-subject complex as an existent or a mode of being having qualities that in truth pertain to primordial awareness—i.e. to the Self-*qua*-Base—that I had to redefine being-for-Self as nondual awareness [of] the mental subject as an object that *is*.)

To sum up all that was established in the above paragraphs: since being-for-Self experiences itself as separate from the Totality that I am calling the Self and its inherent plenitude, it yearns to attain this Totality and plenitude, and its *raison d'être* is to attain this Totality and plenitude: hence the term "being-for-Self." The paradox is that the only way Totality and plenitude could be realized, would be through the dissolution of being-for-Self (that is, of the being / nothingness that believes itself to be separate and different from Totality and plenitude). However, being-for-Self involves compulsive self-affirmation and in the great majority of cases its worst dread is that of dying or disappearing, and therefore it seeks the impossible achievement of attaining totality and plenitude without disappearing

---

[a] Sartre (1980).

as a separate existent of mode of being. Hence the contradiction inherent in being-for-Self, and the reason why Sartre was so right when he wrote the words quoted above:[a]

> Human reality is in its very being suffering, for it arises to being as perpetually haunted by a totality that it is without being able to be it, precisely insofar as it could not attain the in-itself without losing itself *qua* for-Self. Therefore it is by nature unhappy consciousness, without any possible surpassing of the state of unhappiness.

No doubt, human reality is in its very being suffering (*duhkha*), for the mode of being of human consciousness that Sartre called being-for-Self involves the illusion of being-at-a-distance-from-the-plenitude-of-the-*physis*, and therefore it automatically gives rise to a lack-of-plenitude that cannot be surpassed insofar as being-for-Self is manifest. Furthermore, consciousness is bound to face pain, shame, frustration, disappointment, and other unpleasant experiences again and again, for, as shown in A previous chapter and as will be reiterated in the vol. II of this book, emotions based on rejection give rise to unpleasant sensations—and insofar as acceptance cannot be maintained indefinitely, but by the very nature of *samsara* has to alternate with rejection and indifference, we have to face these unpleasant sensations again and again. As we have seen repeatedly, in their turn neutral sensations, if sustained for periods surpassing a given threshold, are interpreted in terms of the concept of "boredom"—which begets rejection that in its turn gives rise to unpleasantness.

Thus Sartre expressed the essence of human existence in our age when he asserted human reality to be unhappy consciousness without any possible surpassing of its state of unhappiness. In fact, the view expressed in this book contradicts Hegelian philosophy and is in agreement with that of the first Sartre in that it proclaims that, so long as being-for-Self persists, and does so in its present condition, it is impossible for us to surpass unhappy consciousness. (For a more detailed consideration of this subject, involving a thorough discussion Shantideva's concept of the three types of suffering inherent in *samsara* and quotations from seventeenth century French philosopher Blaise Pascal, the reader may consult other of my works.[b])

Conclusion

The fact that so long as being-for-Self persists it is impossible to surpass unhappy consciousness, evil and self-hindering, does not at all mean we are doomed to perennial unhappiness, to be always harming others, and to always act clumsily and inaccurately. The alternative to these flaws of the human condition lies in entering the Path of spontaneous liberation of Dzogchen Atiyoga, which consists in the repeated spontaneous liberation (i.e., temporary dissolution) of being-for-Self in the manifestation of the Self-*qua*-Path, which progressively neutralizes the propensity for this mode of being to manifest, and concludes with the definitive extinction of this mode of being in the manifestation of the Self-*qua*-Fruit (which is the final Fruit sought by various mystical traditions).

---

[a] Sartre (1980), p. 134.

[b] Capriles (1977, 1986, 2003). The definitive version of Capriles (2003) will be available in print in the near future.

I coined the term "metaexistential" because the *Existenzphilosophie*[353] developed by the first Heidegger, the existentialism of the first Sartre and other similar systems excluded the possibility of surpassing *ek-sistence* (the core of which is, in terms of this book, the mode of being of human consciousness called being-for-Self) and of dissolving the *phenomenon of being*, and stressed that authenticity would lie in ceasing to elude the naked experience of *being-in-relation-to-death* (Heidegger), the naked experience of the anguish (etc.) that the being of the human individual is (Sartre), and so on—so that the ideal of these philosophies amounts to living in hell. Contrariwise, what I am positing in this book is the surpassing of the *Dasein*, of *ek-sistence* and of the being of the human individual called being-for-Self, in the recurrent manifestation of the Self-*qua*-Path—the manifestation of *nirvana* while on the Path—and finally in the establishment of the Self-*qua*-Fruit corresponding to irreversible, compete Awakening / Enlightenment (*anuttara samyak sambodhi*).

REFERENCES

(INCLUDES REFERENCES IN QUOTATIONS)

Anonymous (2004-2006). Religion Facts: Just the Facts on the World's Religions. http://www.religionfacts.com/a-z-religion-index/bon.htm
Armand, Jorge (1998). *Más allá de la modernidad*: *Del mito del eterno progreso al mito del eterno retorno*. Mérida, Venezuela: Ediciones Actual, Colección Va de Ensayo, DIGECEX, ULA.
Barrett, William (Ed.) (1956). *Zen Buddhism*: *Selected Writings of D. T. Suzuki*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor Books.
Batchelor, Steven (1983). *Alone With Others*: *An Existential Approach to Buddhism*. New York, NY: Grove Weidenfeld.
Bateson, Gregory (1968). Conscious Purpose versus Nature. In Cooper, David (Ed.). *The Dialectics of Liberation*, 34-49. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, UK: Pelican Books.
Bateson, Gregory (1972). *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. New York, NY: Ballantine Books.
Bausani, Alessandro (1988). *El Islam en su cultura.* México, Fondo de Cultura Económica (Breviarios). (Original Italian Ed. 1980.)
Bentov, Itzak (1977). *Stalking the Wild Pendulum.* New York, Dutton.
Bentov, I. y M Bentov (1982), *A Cosmic Book: On the Mechanics of Creation.* New York, Dutton.
Bohm, D., y Hiley, B. (1975), On the Intuitive Understanding of Nonlocality as Implied by Quantum Theory. In *Foundations of Physics*, 5, 1975, 93-109.
Bohm, David (1976), *Fragmentation and Wholeness.* Jerusalem, Israel: The Van Leer Jerusalem Foundation.
Bohm, David (1980). *Wholeness and the Implicate Order.* London: Routledge.
Bohm, David (1982). Interviews. In Wilber, Ken (Ed.) (1982) *The Holographic Paradigm and Other Paradoxes.* Boulder, CO: Shambhala.
Boyers, Robert & Orrill, Robert (Eds.) (1971). *R. D. Laing and Anti-Psychiatry* (includes papers by Peter Sedgwick, Leslie Farber, Joseph Berke, Edgar Friedenberg, Mary Barnes and others). Harmondsworth, Middlesex, UK: Penguin.
Bracht Branham, R. & Goulet-Cazé, M. O. (1996). *The Cynics*: *The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and its Legacy*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press by arrangement with The Regents of the University of California.
Braga, Capone (1931). L'Eraclitismo di Enesidemo. Milan, Italy: *Rivista di Filosofía* 1931, 33-47.
Bréhier, Emile (1988). *Historia de la filosofía*. (2 vol.) (1931/1938. *Histoire de la philosophie*.) Madrid: Tecnos.
Brown, T. S. (1949). *Onesicritus*: *A Study in Hellenistic Historiography*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
Buchner, Hartmut (Ed.) (1989). *Japan und Heidegger*. Sigmaringen, Germany: Thorbecke Verlag.
Burnet, John (1964). *Early Greek Philosophy* (original Ed. 1892). Cleveland, OH: The World Publishing Company.
Cappelletti, Angel J. (1969). *La filosofía de Heráclito de Éfeso* (The Philosophy of Heraclitus of Ephesus). Caracas: Monte Avila.
Cappelletti, Angel J. (1972a). *Los fragmentos de Heráclito* (*Heraclitus' Fragments*). Caracas: Editorial Tiempo Nuevo.
Cappelletti, Angel J. (1972b). *Inicios de la filosofía griega*. Caracas: Editorial Magisterio.

Capra, Fritjof (1983). *The Tao of Physics* (1st Ed, 1975). Boulder, CO: Shambhala.
Capra, Fritjof (1982). *The Turning Point*. New York, NY: Bantam New Age Books.
Capra, Fritjof (1988). *Uncommon Wisdom*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
Capra, Fritjof (1996). *The Web of Life*. New York, NY: Anchor.
Capriles, Elías (1977). *The Direct Path. Providing a Background for Approaching the Practice of* rDzogs-chen. Kathmandu: Mudra Publishing.
Capriles, Elías (1986). *Qué somos y adónde vamos* (*What Are We and Where Are We Going*). Caracas: Unidad de Extensión de la Facultad de Humanidades y Educación de la Universidad Central de Venezuela.
Capriles, Elías (1990a). *The Source of Danger is Fear. Paradoxes of the Realm of Delusion and Instructions for the Practice of the Dzogchen* Upadesha. Mérida, Venezuela: Editorial Reflejos.
Capriles, Elías (1990b). Las aventuras del fabuloso hombre-máquina. Contra Habermas y la *ratio technica* (The Adventures of the Fabulous Machine-Man: Against Habermas and *Ratio Technica*). Mérida, Venezuela: Revista *Actual* de la Universidad de Los Andes, números 16-17.
Capriles, Elías (1992). La inversión hegeliana de la historia (The Hegelian Inversion of History). Mérida, Venezuela: *Filosofía*, Journal of the Master Degree on Philosophy of the University of The Andes, 4, 87-106.
Capriles, Elías (1994a). *Individuo*, *sociedad*, *ecosistema*: *Ensayos sobre filosofía, política y mística* (*Individual*, *Society*, *Ecosystem*: *Essays on Philosophy*, *Politics and Mysticism*). Mérida, Venezuela: Consejo de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Los Andes.
Capriles, Elías (1997a). Pasos hacia una fenomenología metaexistencial de los estados de conciencia (Steps to a Metaexistential Phenomenology of Mental States). Maracaibo, Venezuela, *Utopía y praxis latinoamericana*, 2(2) Jan.-Jun. 1997.
Capriles, Elías (1998a). India: ¿Qué tradición? ¿Continuidad en cuál cambio? In Cejas, Ismael, Ed., *India*: *Tradición y modernidad ¿continuidad en el cambio?* 33-69. Mérida, Venezuela: Ediciones GIEAA y CDCHT de la Universidad de Los Andes.
Capriles, Elías (1998b). En torno a los estudios asiáticos. In Capriles, Elías & Hernán Lucena, Eds., *África y Asia*: *Diálogos en Venezuela*, 139-170. Mérida, Venezuela: Ediciones GIEAA / CDCHT, Universidad de Los Andes.
Capriles, Elías (1999a). Más allá de la mente. Pasos hacia una psicología metatranspersonal. Mérida, Venezuela: *Trasiego*, Faculty of Humanities and Education of the University of The Andes, 9.
Capriles, Elías (1999b). El anarquismo político y gnoseológico de Antístenes en el hilo de Ariadna de una antigua tradición soteriológica (The Political and Epistemological Anarchism of Antisthenes in the Thread of an Ancient Soteriological Tradition). Mérida Venezuela: *Dikaiosyne* (Journal of Grupo Logos—Filosofía, Derecho y Sociedad, Faculty of Legal and Political Sciences, University of The Andes), 2, 67-134.
Capriles, Elías (1999c). Aportes de la India hacia la solución de la crisis global. In Capriles, Elías & Hernán Lucena, Eds., *India*: *De su contribución universal a los pensadores de la independencia*, 45-90. Mérida, Venezuela: Ediciones GIEAA / CDCHT, Universidad de Los Andes.
Capriles, Elías (2000a). *Budismo y dzogchén* (*Buddhism and Dzogchen*): Vitoria, Euskadi, Spain: Ediciones La Llave.
Capriles, Elías (2000b). Estética primordial y arte visionario: Un enfoque cíclico-evolutivo comparado (Primordial Aesthetics and Visionary Art: A Comparative Cyclic-

Evolutionary Approach). Mérida, Venezuela: Publicaciones del Grupo de Investigación en Estudios de Asia y Africa (GIEAA) / CDCHT-ULA.

Capriles, Elías (2000c). Beyond Mind: Steps to a Metatranspersonal Psychology. Honolulu, HI: *The International Journal of Transpersonal Studies*, Vol. 19, 163-184.

Capriles, Elías (2000d). Heráclito y el Oriente. Mérida, Venezuela: *Filosofía*, 11.

Capriles, Elías (2001). The Meaning of Self-Liberation and Loops from The source of danger is fear. Honolulu, HI: *The International Journal of Transpersonal Studies*, 20.

Capriles, Elías (2003). *Buddhism and Dzogchen*: *Volume One*: *Buddhism*: *A Dzogchen Outlook*. Mérida, Venezuela: Website for professors of the University of The Andes, http://www.webdelprofesor.ula.ve/humanidades/elicap/ and Moscow (possibly earlier version): http://www.eliascapriles.dzogchen.ru

Capriles, Elías (2004). *Clear Discrimination of Views Pointing at the Definitive Meaning*: *The Four Philosophical Schools of the Sutrayana Traditionally Taught in Tibet* (*With Reference to the Dzogchen Teachings*). Mérida, Venezuela: Website for professors of the University of The Andes, http://www.webdelprofesor.ula.ve/humanidades/elicap/ and Moscow (possibly earlier version): http://www.eliascapriles.dzogchen.ru

Capriles, Elías (2005). Editor's Introduction to: Gendün Chöphel (2005), *Clarifying the Core of Madhyamaka*: *Ornament of the Thought of Nagarjuna* (English trans. Pema Wangjié & Mulligan, Jean; Elías Capriles, Ed.). Arcidosso, GR, Italy: Shang Shung Edizioni.

Capriles, Elías (undated). Pasos hacia una hermenéutica metaontológica (Steps to a metaontological hermeneutics). Caracas: Proceedings of the 5th National Conference on Philosophy, held in November 1999 at the Central University of Venezuela. Internet: http://150.185.88.116/humanitas2/temas/Filosof%C3%ADa/Eventos/Pro/ONTOLOGICO.htm

Capriles, Elías (2006). Beyond Mind II: Further Steps to a Metatranspersonal Philosophy and Psychology. San Francisco, CA: *The International Journal of Transpersonal Studies*, vol. 24. (Saybrook Graduate School and Research Center.)

Capriles, Elías (work in progress 2). *Individuo, sociedad, ecosistema*. (Individual, Society, Ecosystem.) (2d Edition, revised, corrected and expanded, of Capriles, Elías, 1994a.)

Capriles, Elias (work in progress 3). *Greek Philosophy and the East*.

Carré, Patrick (1999). *Nostalgie de la vacuité* (*Nostalgia of Voidness*). Paris: Pauvert. (Revised and amended version of [1991] *D'Elis à Taxila*, *eloge de la vacuité* [*From Elis to Taxila: In Praise of Voidness*]. Paris: Éd. Criterion.)

Carré, Patrick (2001). Pyrrhon: 'Abolir tous les étants' (Pyrrho: 'Abolishing all entities'). Paris: *Magazine Littéraire*, No. 394, January 2001, 25-27.

Chöphel, Gendün (2005). *Clarifying the Core of Madhyamaka*: *Ornament of the Thought of Nagarjuna* (English trans., Pema Wangjié & Mulligan, Jean; Elías Capriles Ed. and Introduction). Arcidosso, GR, Italy: Shang Shung Edizioni.

Claudel Paul (1943) *Art Poétique*. *Connaissance du temps*. *Traité de la co-naissance au monde et de soi-même*. *Développement de l'église*. Paris: Mercure de France. (Original Ed. 1907 by the same publishers.)

Conche, Marcel (1994). *Pyrrhon ou l'apparence* (*Pyrrho or Appearance*). Paris, Editions P.U.F. (2d. Ed. of 1973. Villers-sur-Mer, France: Éditions du Mégare).

Cooper, David E. (1967). *Psychiatry and Antipsychiatry*. New York, NY: Ballantine.

Cooper, David E. (Ed.) (1968). *The Dialectics of Liberation*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, UK: Pelican Books.

Cornu, Philippe (2001). *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique du Bouddhisme*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
Creel, Herrlee G. (1970), *What is Taoism? and Other Studies in Chinese Cultural History*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
Daniélou, Alain (1992). *Gods of Love and Ecstasy*: *The Traditions of Shiva and Dionysus* (original French Ed. 1979). Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions International.
DeMeo, James (1998). *Saharasia*. Ashland, OR: Natural Energy Works (Orgone Biophysical Research Lab).
Derrida, Jacques (1967). *La voix et le phenomene*. *Introduction au problème du signe dans la phénomenologie de Husserl*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. (English Ed., 1973. *Speech and Phenomena' and Other Essays on Husserl's Theory of Signs*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.)
Diogenes Laërtius (1972-1979). *Lives of eminent philosophers*. *With an English translation by R.D.Hicks* (2 vols). Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, Loeb Classical Library.
Dreyfus, George B. J. (1997), *Recognizing Reality*: *Dharmakirti's Philosophy and its Tibetan Interpretations*. Albany (NY): SUNY Press.
Dudjom Rinpoche (1991). *The Nyingma School of Tibetan Buddhism* (2 vol.; trans.: G. Dorje & M. Kapstein). Boston, MA: Wisdom Publications.
Eisler, Riane (1987). *The Chalice and the Blade*: *Our History*, *Our Future*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.
Feyerabend, Paul K. (1982). *La ciencia en una sociedad libre* (*Science in a Free Society*). Mexico, Madrid & Bogotá: Siglo XXI Editores. (Original English Ed. 1980.)
Feyerabend, Paul K. (1984). *Contra el método*. *Esquema de una teoría anarquista del conocimiento* (*Against Method*. *Schema of an Anarchist Theory of Knowledge*). Barcelona, Spain: Historia del pensamiento, Editorial Orbis. (Original English Ed. 1970; 1st Spanish Ed. 1974.)
Feyerabend, Paul K. (1987). *Adiós a la razón* (*Farewell to Reason*). Madrid: Editorial Tecnos. (1st Spanish Ed. 1984.)
Freud, Sigmund (1974). *Proyecto de una psicología para neurólogos* [*Project for a Scientific Psychology*]. Madrid: Alianza Editorial. (Original German Ed. 1895.)
Fromm, Erich; Suzuki, D. T. & De Martino, Richard (1960). *Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis*. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers.
Gadamer, Hans-Georg (1995). *El inicio de la filosofia occidental*. *Lecciones compiladas por Vittorio De Cesare* (*The Beginning of Western Philosophy*. *Lessons Edited by Vittorio De Cesare*). Barcelona, Spain-Buenos Aires-Mexico: Paidós. (Original Italian Ed. 1993.)
Gendün Chöphel (2005). *Clarifying the Core of Madhyamaka*: *Ornament of the Thought of Nagarjuna* (English trans., Pema Wangjié & Mulligan, Jean; Elías Capriles Ed. and Introduction). Arcidosso, GR, Italy: Shang Shung Edizioni.
Gilligan, Carol (1982). *In a Different Voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Gladisch, August (1858). *Empedokles und die Aegypter* : *Eine historische Untersuchung*. Leipzig, Germany: Hinrichs
Gladisch, August (1859). *Herakleitos und Zoroaster* : *Eine historische Untersuchung*. Leipzig, Germany: Hinrichs.
Gladisch, August (1864). *Anaxagoras und die Israeliten* : *Eine historische Untersuchung*. Leipzig, Germany: Hinrichs.

Gladisch, August (1866). *Die Hyperboreer und die alten Chinesen* : *Eine historische Untersuchung*. Leipzig, Germany: Hinrichs.
Gómez de Liaño, Ignacio (1998). *El círculo de la sabiduría* (*The Circle of Wisdom*). Madrid: Ediciones Siruela.
Guenther, Herbert V. (1964). *Philosophy and Psychology in the Abhidharma*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. (Another edition: Berkeley 1976).
Guenther, Herbert V. (1984). *Matrix of Mystery*. *Scientific and Humanistic Aspects of* rDzogs-chen *Thought*. Boulder, CO: Shambhala.
Guenther, Herbert V. (1993). *Ecstatic Spontaneity*: *Saraha's Three Cycles of Doha*. Berkeley, CA: Asian Humanities Press.
Guenther, Herbert V. & Kawamura, Leslie (1975). *Mind in Buddhist Psychology*. *A translation of Ye shes rGgyal mtshan's The Necklace of Clear Understanding*. Emeryville, CA: Dharma Publishing.
Habermas, Jurgen (1987). *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*: *Twelve Lectures*. (Tr. by Frederick Lawrence.) Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1955). *The Phenomenology of Mind*. London: Allen & Unwin (2nd Revised English Ed.). (Spanish translation 1966. *Fenomenología del espíritu*. Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica.)
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1968). *Philosophy of Right*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1988). *Introduction to the Philosophy of History*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Pub Co Inc. (Original German Ed. 1827.)
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1990). *Hegel's Science of Logic*. Amherst, NY: Humanity Books (a division of Prometheus Books). (Spanish translation by Augusta & Roberto Mondolfo, Hachette 1956, Solar 1976. *Ciencia de la lógica*. 2 vols. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Solar.)
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1991). *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences in Outline and Critical Writings*. New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing Group.
Heidegger, Martin (1929). *Was ist Metaphysik?* In Heidegger, M. (1976). *Gesamtausgabe*, *IX*: *Wegmarken*, p.103-122. Frankfurt am Main, Germany) Vittorio Klostermann. (In the original Ed. of *Wegmarken*, before being included in *Gesamtausgabe*, 1-19.)
Heidegger, Martin (1938). *Die Zeit des Weltbildes* (translated as The Age of the World Picture). In Heidegger, M. (1977). *Gesamtausgabe*, *V*, *Holzwege* (translated as *Off the Beaten Track*), 69-104. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann.
Heidegger, Martin (1943). Aletheia. In Heidegger, M. (1975). *Early Greek Thinking*, 102-123. New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishers.
Heidegger, Martin (1947). Letter on Humanism (addressed to Jean Baufret). In Heidegger, Martin, 1978, Ed. D. F. Krell.
Heidegger, Martin (1951). Logos. In Heidegger, M. (1975), *Early Greek Thinking*, 59-78. New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishers.
Heidegger, Martin (1953/54). Aus einem Gespräch von der Sprache. Zwischen einem Japaner und einem Fragenden. In (1985). *Unterwegs zur Sprache* (1950-1959) [*Gesamtausgabe 12*]. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Vittorio Klostermann. (English 1971; this. Ed. 1982. *On the Way to Language*. New York: Harper & Row.)

Heidegger, Martin (1954a). Moira (Parmenides VIII, 34-41). In Heidegger, M. (1954), *Vorträge und Aufsätze*. Pfullingen, Germany: Neske Verlag. (English in Heidegger, M. 1975. *Early Greek Thinking*, 79-101. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.)

Heidegger, Martin (1954b). Wissenschaft und Besinnung. In Heidegger, M. (1954), *Vorträge und Aufsätze*. Pfullingen, Germany: Neske Verlag.

Heidegger, Martin (1954c). Wer ist Nietzsches Zarathustra? In Heidegger, M. (1954), *Vorträge und Aufsätze*. Pfullingen, Germany: Neske Verlag.

Heidegger, Martin (1955). Zur Seinsfrage. In Heidegger, M. (1976) *Gesamtausgabe*, *IX*: *Wegmarken*, 385-426. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Vittorio Klostermann.

Heidegger, Martin (1957). Der Satz der Identität. In (1957/1976) *Identität und Differenz*, p. 25. Now in (1994) *Gesamtausgabe*, *LXXIX*: *Bremer und Freiburger Vorträge*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Vittorio Klostermann.

Heidegger, Martin (1958). Grundsätze des Denkens. In *Jahrbuch für Psychologie und Psychotherapie* (6) 1-3, 1958, p. 40. Now in (1994) *Gesamtausgabe*, *LXXIX*: *Bremer und Freiburger Vorträge*, p. 93. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Vittorio Klostermann.

Heidegger, Martin (1959). Das Wesen der Sprache. In (1985) *Gesamtausgabe, XII*: *Unterwegs zur Sprache*, p. 187. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Vittorio Klostermann.

Heidegger, Martin (1971). The Origin of the Work of Art. In Heidegger, M. (1971). *Poetry*, *Language*, *Thought* (English trans. Albert Hofstadter), 17-79. New York, NY: HarperCollins. (Original German Ed. 1936.)

Heidegger, Martin (1976) *Das Spiegel*—Interview. In Neske, G. & Kettering, E. (Eds.) (1988) *Antwort*. *Martin Heidegger im Gespräch*. Pfullingen: Neske Verlag.

Heidegger, Martin (1980), *Introducción a la metafísica* (trans. Emilio Estiú). Buenos Aires: Editorial Nova.

Heidegger, Martin (1987). *An Introduction to Metaphysics* (*Einführung in Die Metaphysik*; English translation by Max Niemeyer). New Haven and London: Yale University Press. (Original German edition 1953. Tübingen (Germany): Max Niemeyer Verlag, 157 pp. 1st English Ed. of this trans. 1959.)

Heidegger, Martin (1988). *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology* (*Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*; trans. Albert Hofstadter). Bloomington and Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press. (Revised Ed. of English version of 1982.) (Original German Ed. 1975.)

Heidegger, Martin (1989). Überlieferte Sprache und technische Sprache. St Gallen: Erker. (Original Ed. 1962.)

Heidegger, Martin (1992). *Séjours / Aufenthalte* (French bilingual Ed. François Vezin, trans. and notes). Monaco: Éd. du Rocher. (Original German Ed. 1989.)

Heidegger, Martin (1996). *Being and Time* (trans. Joan Stambaugh). Albany, NY: SUNY Press. (1927. Original German Ed. 1953.)

Heidegger, Martin (1997). *Der Satz vom Grund* [*Gesamtausgabe 10*]. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Vittorio Klostermann.

Heisig, James W. (2001). *Philosophers of Nothingness*: *An Essay on the Kyoto School*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai‘i Press. In this regard cf. also the Internet URL: www.nanzan-u.ac.jp/SHUBUNKEN.

Husserl, Edmund (1982). *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy* (trans. F. Kersten). Dordrecht, Holland: Kluwer. (Original German Ed. 1913.)

Iqbal, Afzal (1964). *Life and Work of Rumi*. Lahore, Pakistan: Institute of Islamic Culture.

Jung, Carl Gustav (1928). Psychological Commentary. In Padmasambhava according to Karma Lingpa (English 1928; Translation by Kazi-Dawa Samdup; Edited and Annotated by W. E. Evans-Wentz). *Tibetan Book of the Dead* (*Bardo Thödröl* [Bar do Thos grol.). London: Oxford University Press.

Jung, Carl Gustav (1954). Psychological Commentary. In Padmasambhava according to Karma Lingpa (1954). *The Tibetan Book of the Great Liberation or the Method of Realizing Nirvana Through Knowing the Mind*. London: Oxford University Press.

Jung, Carl Gustav (1968). *Man and His Symbols*. New York, NY: Dell Pub.

Jung, Carl Gustav (1972). *Mandala Symbolism* (3 works) (Ed. Gerhard Adler; trans., R. F. C. Hull). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kant, Immanuel (1922). *Der einzig mögliche Beweisgrund zu einer Demonstration des Daseins Gottes*. Berlin : Ernst Cassirer.

Kant, Immanuel (1966). *Critique of Pure Reason*. Garden City, NJ: Anchor Books. (Reprint.) For the German original version of the 1st and 2d Eds. (1781 and 1787, respectively), cf. Kant, Immanuel, Raymund Schmidt Ed. (1956), and Kant, Immanuel, Ingeborg Heidemann Ed. (1966).

Kerényi, Karl (1998). *Dionisios*: *Raíz de la vida indestructible*. Barcelona, Spain: Herder. (Original German Ed. 1994.)

Kierkegaard, Søren (1968). *Fear and Trembling* / *The Sickness Unto Death* (trans. W. Lowrie). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Original Eds. of this trans. 1944 / 1941.)

Kierkegaard, Søren (1970). *The Concept of Dread* (trans. W. Lowrie). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Original Ed. of this trans. 1944.)

Kirk, Geoffrey Steven; Raven, John Earle & Schofield, M. (1970). *Los filósofos presocráticos*. *Historia crítica con selección de textos* (*The Pre-Socratic Philosophers*). Madrid: Editorial Gredos. (Original English Ed. 1966.)

Kirkland, Russell (undated). Person and Culture in the Taoist Tradition. Internet: http://www.arches.uga.edu/~kirkland/rk/pdf/guides/PERSON.pdf

Korzybski, Alfred (4th Ed. 5th printing 1973). *Science and Sanity*: *An Introduction to Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics*. Lakeville, CT: International Non-Aristotelian Library Publishing Company. (Original Ed. 1933.)

Koyré, Alexandre (1973). *Études d'histoire de la pensée scientifique*. Paris: Gallimard.

Kuhn, Thomas S. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Laing, Ronald D. (1970). *Knots*. London: Tavistock. (Paperback 1971. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, UK: Penguin.)

Laing, Adrian (1996). *R. D. Laing*: *A Biography*. New York, NY: Thunder's Mouth Press.

Lenin (Ulianov), Vadimir Illich (1972), *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*. Peking: Foreign Language Press.

LeShan, Lawrence (1982). *The Medium, the Mystic, and the Physicist*: *Toward a General Theory of the Paranormal*. New York, NY: Ballantine Publishing Group.

Longchenpa (Longchen Rabjam; translated & annotated by Herbert V. Guenther) (1975a). *Kindly Bent to Ease Us*: *The Trilogy of Finding Comfort and Ease*: *Part One*: *Mind* (trans. Herbert V. Guenther). Berkeley, CA: Dharma Publishing.

Longchenpa (Longchen Rabjam; translated & annotated by Herbert V. Guenther) (1976). *Kindly Bent to Ease Us*: *The Trilogy of Finding Comfort and Ease*: *Part Three*: *Wonderment*. Emeryville, CA: Dharma Publishing.

Longchen Rabjam (1998). *The Precious Treasury of the Way of Abiding*. Junction City, CA: Padma Publishing.

Longchen Rabjam (2001). *A Treasure Trove of Scriptural Transmission*: *A Commentary on* The Precious Treasury of the Basic Space of Phenomena. Junction City, CA: Padma Publishing.

Löwith, Karl (1988). *Ma vie en Allemagne avant et après 1933*. Paris: Hachette.

Löwith, Karl; Kenjirõ Yoshioka & Giancarlo Vianello (1995). *La scuola di Kyôto* (*The Kyoto School*). Soveria Mannelli / Messina, Italy: Rubbettino Editore.

Luk, Charles (1972). *The Vimalakirti Nirdesa Sutra*. Berkeley, CA: Shambhala Publications.

Marcovich, Miroslav (1967). *Heraclitus*: *Greek Text with a Short Commentary*. Mérida, Venezuela: The Los Andes University Press.

May, Reinhard (1996). *Heidegger's Hidden Sources*. *East Asian Influences on his Work*. London: Routledge. (Original German Ed. 1989.)

McEviley, Thomas (1982). Pyhrrhonism and Madhyamika. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press, *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 32, 1982, 3-35.

Münster, Arno (2002). *Heidegger*, *la science allemande et le national-socialisme*. Paris: Kimé.

Namkhai Norbu (1996). *Drung, deu e bön*. *Le narrazioni, i linguaggi simbolici e il Bön nell' antico Tibet*. Arcidosso, GR, Italy: Shang-Shung Edizioni.

Namkhai Norbu (1997a). *La collana di zi*. Arcidosso, GR, Italy: Shang Shung Edizioni.

Namkhai Norbu (1988). *Un'introduzione allo Dzog-chen*. *Risposte a sedici domande*. Arcidosso, GR, Italy: Shang Shung Edizioni.

Namkhai Norbu (1999). *The Crystal and the Way of Light*: *Sutra*, *Tantra and Dzogchen*. Revised Edition: Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion. (Original Ed. 1986.)

Namkhai Norbu (2004). *The Necklace of Zi*: *On the History and Culture of Tibet*. Arcidosso, GR, Italy: Shang Shung Edizioni. (There is an older English edition published by the Library of Tibetan Works and Archives in Dharamsala, India. The present edition is a translation into English of the Italian version of 1997 carried out by Barrie Simmons with thanks to Nancy Simmons.)

Namkhai Norbu (unpublished ms.). *La vía de autoliberación y nuestra total plenitud y perfección*. (E. Capriles, Ed.)

Namkhai Norbu & Clemente, Adriano (1999). *The Supreme Source*: *The Fundamental Tantra of the Dzogchen Semde*. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion. (Original Italian Ed. Italian, 1997.)

Napper, Elizabeth (2003). *Dependent-Arising and Emptiness*: *A Tibetan Buddhist Interpretation of Madhyamika Philosophy Emphasizing the Compatibility of Emptiness and Conventional Phenomena*. Boston, MA: Wisdom Publications.

Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm (1920). *The Antichrist* (Translated from the German with an Introduction By H. L. Mencken). New York: Knopf. (Original German Ed. 1888.)

Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm (1968). *The Will To Power* (trans. Walter Kaufman & R. J. Hollingdale). New York, NY: Vintage.

Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm (1997a). *Twilight of the Idols*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing. (Original German Ed. 1889.)

Obermiller, E. (1999). [*Butön's*] *History of Buddhism in India and Tibet*. New Delhi: Paljor Publications.

Ohashi, R. (1986). Zur Philosophie der Kyoto-Schule. In *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* (40), 1986, 121-134.

Ohashi, R. Die Frühe Heidegger-Rezeption in Japan. In Buchner, Hartmut (Ed. 1989). *Japan und Heidegger*, pp. 23-37. Sigmaringen (Germany): Thorbecke Verlag.

Padmasambhava according to Karma Lingpa (1938). *Das Tibetanische Totenbuch* (Aus der englischen Fassung des Lama Kazi Dawa Samdup Hrsg. von W. Y. Evans-Wentz. Übers. und eingeleitet von Louise Göpfert-March. Mit einem psychologischen Kommentar von C. G. Jung). Zürich, Switzerland & Leipzig, Germany: Rascher Verlag.

Pániker, Salvador (1992). *Filosofia y mística*. *Una lectura de los griegos* (*Philosophy and Mysticism*: *A Reading of the Greeks*). Barcelona, Spain: Editorial Anagrama.

Parkes, Graham (1997). The putative fascism of the Kyoto School and the political correctness of the modern academy. *Philosophy East & West* 47:3 (July 1,1997). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press,.

Parmenides (1984). *Parmenides of Elea*: *Fragments*: *A Text and Translation with an Introduction* (Intr. by David Gallop). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Plato (1949). *Meno*. Indianapolis, IN: The Bobbs-Merril Company, Inc.

Plato (1973). *Gorgias*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, UK: Penguin.

Plato (1979). *The Republic*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, UK: Penguin Books.

Plato (1980). *Phaedo*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.

Plato (1993). *Sophist*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Pub Co Inc.

Plato (1995), *Symposium*. Rutherford, NJ: Penguin USA.

Plato (1998). *Cratylus*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Pub Co Inc.

Popper, Karl R. (1961). *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. New York, NY: Science Editions, Inc. (Original Ed. 1959.)

Price, Henry Habberley (2d. Ed. 1969). *Thinking and Experience*. London: Hutchinson University Library.

Reid, Daniel (2002/2003). *Practice Makes Perfect*: *Common Grounds in the Practice Paths of Chuan Chen Tao and Dzogchen Dharma*. Conway, Mass, *The Mirror* # 63, December 2002/January 2003, pp. 26-7.

Reynolds, John Myrdhin (1996). *The Golden Letters*. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion Publications.

Ricard, Mathieu & Thuan, Trinh Xuan (2004). *The Quantum and the Lotus*: *A Journey to the Frontiers where Science and Buddhism Meet*. New York, NY: Random House Inc.

Rockhill, William Woodville (1997). *Land of the Lamas*. New Delhi: Asian Educational Services.

Rombach, Heinrich (1986), Völkerbegegnung im Zeichen der Philosophie. In Stadt Meßkirch (City of Messkirch) (Ed. 1986). *Heimat der Philosophie* / *Symposion 1985 anlässlich der Städtpartnerschaftsbesiegelung zwischen Meßkirch und Unoke als Geburtstädten von Martin Heidegger und Kitaro Nishida*, pp. 23-48. Meßkirch (Germany): Stadt Meßkirch.

Ruegg, David Seyfort (1981). *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India*. Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz.

Russell, Bertrand & Whitehead, Alfred North (1910-1913) *Principia Mathematica* (3 vol.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Sartre, Jean-Paul (1950). *L'imagination*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. (Original Ed. 1936.)

Sartre, Jean-Paul (1940). *L'imaginaire*. *Psychologie phénoménologique de l'imagination*. Paris: NRF Librairie Gallimard.
Sartre, Jean-Paul (1980). *L'être et le néant*. *Essai d'ontologie phénoménologique* (*Being and Nothingness*: *An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology*). Paris: NRF Librairie Gallimard. (Original Ed. 1943; the 1980 Ed. is the 31st edition.)
Sartre, Jean-Paul (1982). El existencialismo es un humanismo (Existentialism is a Humanism). In Sartre, J. P. and Heidegger, M. (1982), *El existencialismo es un humanismo y Carta sobre el humanismo* (*Existentialism is a Humanism and Letter on Humanism*). Buenos Aires: Ediciones del 80. (Original French Ed. 1946.)
Saviani, Carlo (2004). *El Oriente de Heidegger* (Raquel Bouso García, trans.). Barcelona, Spain: Herder. (Original Italian Ed. 1998. *L'Oriente di Heidegger*. Genova, Italy: Il nuovo melangolo, s.r.l.)
Schweitzer, Albert (1957). *Indian Thought and Its Development*. Boston, MA and London: Beacon Press. (Originally published in 1935; English 1936.)
Sellers, Jonathan (1997-2003). The Pure Brethen of Basra: Isma'ili, Yezidi, Sufi. Internet: http://www.antiqillum.com/texts/bg/Qadosh/qadosh034.htm
Shapiro, Sam 1. (1986). The Neglect of Asian Psychology in the United States. Kyoto, Japan: *Psychologia*, 1986, 29, 10-17.
Shapiro, Sam I. & Castillo, Richard J. (1986/1987). Directions in the Development of Transpersonal Psychology. Wollongong, NSW, Australia: *Australian Journal of Transpersonal Studies*, 6(2), 91-99.
Shen, Tsung-lien (1973). *Tibet and the Tibetans*. New York, NY: Octagon Books. (Original Ed. 1953.)
Smith, Huston (1986/88). Preface to Kapleau Roshi, P. (1986/88). *Los tres pilares del zen*: *Enseñanza*, *práctica*, *iluminación* (*The Three Pillars of Zen*). Mexico City: Árbol Editorial S.A. de C.V. (Original English Ed. 1985.)
Sorel, Georges (2a ed. 1922). *Introduction à l'économie moderne*. París: Marcel Rivière. En http://pages.infinit.net/sociojmt (1a edición: 1903).
Sorel, Georges (1906). *Le système historique de Renan*. París: G. Jacques.
Sorel, Georges (1908). *Les illusions du progrès*. París: Marcel Rivière.
Stadt Meßkirch (City of Messkirch) (Ed. 1986). *Heimat der Philosophie* / *Symposion 1985 anlässlich der Städtpartnerschaftsbesiegelung zwischen Meßkirch und Unoke als Geburtstädten von Martin Heidegger und Kitaro Nishida*. Meßkirch (Germany).
Suzuki, Daisetz Teitaro (1900). *Acvaghosha's Discourse on the Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana*. Chicago, IL: Open Court Publishing Company.
Tannen, Deborah (1990). *You Just Don't Understand*: *Men and Women in Conversation*. New York, NY: Ballantine.
Tarthang Tulku (1977a). *Time, Space and Knowledge*: *A New Vision of Reality*. Emeryville, CA: Dharma Publishing.
Taylor, Steve (2003). Primal Spirituality and the Onto/Philo Fallacy: A Critique of the Claim that Primal Peoples Were/Are Less Spiritually and Socially Developed than Modern Humans. San Francisco, CA: Saybrook Graduate School and Research Center, *International Journal of Transpersonal Studies*, Vol. 22, 61-76.
Taylor, Steve (2005). *The Fall*: *The Evidence for a Golden Age, 6,000 Years of Insanity, and the Dawning of a New Era*. Winchester, UK / New York, NY: The Bothy, John Hunt Publishing LTD., O Books.

Thinley Norbu (1985). *The Small Golden Key* (*to the Treasure of the Various Essential Necessities of General and Extraordinary Buddhist Dharma*) (Trans. L. Anderson). New York, NY: Jewel Publications. (Original English Ed. 1977.)
Thinle Norbu Rinpoche (1997), *Welcoming Flowers from across the Cleansed Threshold of Hope*: *An Answer to the Pope's Criticism of Buddhism*. New York, Jewel Publishing House.
Tucci, Giuseppe (1980). *The religions of Tibet*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. (Original German Ed. 1970.)
Under the Direction of Brice Parain (1972). *Historia de la Filosofía Siglo XXI Editores*: *Del mundo romano al islam medieval*. Mexico City: Siglo XXI Editores. (Original French Ed. 1969.)
Under the Direction of Yvon Belaval (1981). *Historia de la Filosofía Siglo XXI Editores*: La filosofía en Oriente. Mexico City: Siglo XXI Editores. (Original French Ed. 1974.)
van der Dennen, Johan M. G. (1995). *The Origin of War*: *The Evolution of a Male-Coalitional Reproductive Strategy*. Groningen, NL: Origin Press.
Vásquez, Eduardo (2005). Excerpt from Karl Löwith's *Ma vie en Allemagne avant et après 1933*. Mérida, Venezuela: *Dikaiosyne* (Journal of Grupo Logos—Filosofía, Derecho y Sociedad, Faculty of Legal and Political Sciences, University of The Andes), 14, 2005.
Venkata Ramanan, K. (1966). *Nagarjuna's Philosophy*. Rutland, VT: Charles E. Tuttle, for the Harvard-Yenching Institute.
Ware, James R. (1981), *Alchemy, Medicine and Religion in the China of A.D. 320*: *The* Nei P'ien *of Ko Hung* (*Pao-p'u tzu*). New York, Dover Publications.
Wasserman, James (2001). *The Templars and the Assassins*: *The Militia of Heaven*. Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions International.
Watts, Alan W. (1969). *The Book*: *On the Taboo Against Knowing Who or What You Are*. New York, NY: Collier Books.
Watts, Alan W. (1975a). *Psychotherapy East and West*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
Watts, Alan (1975b), *Tao—The Watercourse Way* (written in 1973, with the collaboration of Al Chung-Liang Huang). New York, Pantheon Books.
Wayman, Alex (1973), *The Buddhist Tantras*: New Light on Indo-Tibetan Esotericism. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Wayman, Alex (1979). *Calming the Mind and Discerning the Real*: *Buddhist Meditation and the Middle View* (*From the* Lam rim chen mo *of Tsong-kha pa*). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Pub. Pvt. Ltd. (Original Ed. 1978.)
Wayman, Alex (1980), *Yoga of the Guhyasamajatantra*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
Wilber, Ken (1981). *Up from Eden*. Wheaton, IL: Quest Books. (Spanish 1995), *Después del Edén*. Barcelona, Spain: Kairós.
Wilber, Ken (Ed.) (1982). *The Holographic Paradigm and Other Paradoxes.* Boulder, CO and London: Shambhala Publications.
Wilber, Ken (Ed.) (1984). *Quantum Questions*: *Mystical Writings of the World's Great Physicists*. Boulder, CO and London: Shambhala Publications.
Wilber, Ken (1995). *Sex*, *Ecology*, *Spirituality*. Boston, MA & London: Shambhala.
Wilber, Ken (1996a). *Brief History of Everything*. Boston, MA & London: Shambhala.
Wilber, Ken (1998). A More Integral Approach. In Rothberg, Donald & Kelly, Sean (Eds.), *Ken Wilber in Dialogue*, pp. 306-367. Wheaton, IL: Quest Books.
Wilhelm, Richard (1962). *The Secret of the Golden Flower*: *A Chinese Book of Life*. New York, N.Y.: Harvest/HBJ Books.

Wisser, Richard (Ed.) (1970). *Martin Heidegger im Gespräch*. Freiburg: Karl Aler (also in *Gesamtausgabe 16*).

Witteveen, H. Johannes (1997). *Universal Sufism*. Shaftesbury, Dorset (England, UK) / Rockport, Mass.: Element Books Ltd.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig (1968). *Philosophical Investigations* (3d ed.). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Wong-Mou-Lam (trans. 1969). The Sutra of Hui Neng. In Price, A. F. & Wong Mou-Lam, *The Diamond Sutra and The Sutra of Hui Neng*. Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications.

Zolla, Elémire (1994). *Lo stupore infantile*. Milan, Italy: Adelphi.

Zukav, Gary (1979), *The Dancing Wu Li Masters. An Overview of the New Physics.* New York, NY: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON HEIDEGGER AND EASTERN THOUGHT (FROM SAVIANI, CARLO, 2004)

I. THE CONFRONTATION WITH TAOISM

Chan, W C. (1986). Heidegger and Chinese Philosophy. Taipei.

Chang, Ch.-Yuan (1970), Commentary on J. Glenn Gray's "Splendor of the simple." In Heidegger and Eastern Thought, in *Philosophy East and West*, Honolulu 20(3), 1970, 241-246.

Chang, Ch.-Yuan (1970). *Creativity and Taoism*. New York.

Chang, Ch.-Yuan (1975). *Tao*: *A New Way of Thinking*. New York.

Chang, Ch.-Yuan (1977a). The Philosophy of Taoism according to Chuang-tzu. In *Philosophy East and West* 27(4), 1977.

Chang, Ch.-Yuan (1977b). Reflections. In Neske, G. (Ed.) (1977), 65-70.

Charles, D. (1983). L'Ereignis dans le Tao. In *L'Herne*: *Martin Heidegger* (Ed., Michel Haar), 449-452. Paris.

Cheng, Ch.-Ying (1978). Remarks on Ontological and Trans-ontological Foundations of Language. In *Journal of Chinese Philosophy,* 5, 1978.

Cho, K. K. (1987). *Bewusstsein und Natursein*. Freiburg / München (Germany).

Cho, K. K. (1992). Heidegger und die Rückkehr in den Ursprung. In (D. Papenfuss, Ed.) (1992). *Zur philosophischen Aktualität Heideggers,* 3, 299-324. Frankfurt am Main.

Fu, Ch. Wei-Hsun (1976). Hermeneutics: Taoist Metaphysics and Heidegger. In *Journal of Chinese Philosophy,* 3, 1976.

Fu, Ch. Wei-Hsun (1978). The Trans-onto-theo-logical Foundations of Language in Heidegger and Taoism. In *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 5, 1978, 301-333.

Gray, G. (1970). Splendor of the Simple. In Heidegger and Eastern Thought, in *Philosophy East and West*. Honolulu 20(3), 1970, 229-240.

Heim, M. (1984). A Philosophy of Comparison: Heidegger and Lao Tzu. In *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 11, 1984, 307-335.

Hirsch, E. F (1970). Martin Heidegger and the East. In Heidegger and Eastern Thought, in *Philosophy East and West*. Honolulu 20(3), 1970, 247-263.

Hsiao, P. Shi-yi (1977). Wir trafen uns am Holzmarktplatz. In Neske, G. (Ed.) (1977), 119-129.

Hsiao, P. Shi-yi (1987). Heidegger and our Translation of the *Tao-Te-Ching*, in (Ed. G. Parkes, 1987) *Heidegger and Asian Thought*, 93-101. Honolulu.

Hsiung, W. (1992), Chinesische Heidegger-Rezeption. In (Ed., D. Papenfuss - O. Pöggeler). *Zur philosophischen Aktualität Heideggers*, 3, 292-298. Frankfurt am Main.

Jung, Hwa Yol (1987). Heidegger's Way with Sinitic Thinking. In (Ed., Graham Parkes) *Heidegger and Asian Thought*, 217-244. Honolulu.

Maxia, B. (1986) Heidegger's Fieldpath: An Interpretation in Perspective of Chuang Tzu. In *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 13, 1986, 445-453.

May, R. (1989). *Ex oriente lux. Heideggers Werk unter ostasiastischen Einfluss*. Wiesbaden, Germany. (English translation included in main Bibliography.)

Ohashi, R. (1989). Heidegger und die Frage nach der abendländischen Moderne — ausgehend von einem Text Tschuang Tses. In (Ed., Thomas Buchheim) *Destruktion und Übersetzung*. *Zu den Aufgaben von Philosophigeschichte nach Martin Heidegger*, 129-139. Weinheim (Germany).

Parkes, G. (1984). Intimations of Taoist Ideas in Early Heidegger. In *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 11(4), 1984, 353-374.

Parkes, G. (1987). Thoughts on the Way: Being and Time vía Lao-Chuang. In (Ed., Graham Parkes) *Heidegger and Asian Thought*, 105-144. Honolulu.

Puggeler, O. (1987), West-East Dialogue —Heidegger and Lao-tzu. In *Heidegger and Asian Thought*, 47-78. Honolulu.

Smith, C. T, (1967). A Heideggerian Interpretation of the Way of Lao Tzu. In *Ching Feng*, 10, 1967.

Stambaugh, J. (1987). Heidegger, Taoism and the Question of Metaphysics. In (Ed., Graham Parkes) *Heidegger and Asian Thought*, 105-144. Honolulu.

Strolz, W. (1984). Heideggers Entsprechung zum Tao-Te-King und Zen-Buddhismus. In (Ed., Walter Strolz) *Sein und Nichts in der abendländischen Mystik*, 83-106. Freiburg Br.

Vetsch, E. (1992). *Heideggers Angang der interkulturellen Auseinandersetzung*. Würzburg, Germany.

II. THE CONFRONTATION WITH ZEN BUDDHISM (in chronological order)

Tsujimura, K. (1957; Italian 1960). Del nulla nello Zen (Italian trans. of Vom Nichts im Zen). In *Il Pensiero*, V(1), 5-16.

Nielsen, N. C. (1960). Zen-Buddhism and the Philosophy of Heidegger. In (1960). *Atti del XII Congresso Internazionale Filosofia* (Venice, 1958), vol. 10. Florence (Italy), 131-137.

Tanabe, H. (1959). Todesdialektik. In (Ed., G. Neske) *Martin Heideggers zum 70. Geburtstag*, 93-133. Pfullingen (Germany).

Guzzoni (1963). Die Kunst und das Denken (Art and Thought). Originally in (1963). *Heidegger und Hisamatsu und ein Zuhörer* (Tokyo: trilingual publication in Japanese, German and English). Now in Buchner (Ed. 1989), pp. 211-15.

Nishitani, K. (1966). Two Addresses by Martin Heidegger. In *The Eastern Buddhist*, 1, 1966, 48-59. (German trans. 1989). Vorbereitende Bemerkungen zu zwei Meßkircher Ansprachen von Martin Heidegger. In H. Buchner (Ed.) *Japan und Heidegger*, 147-158. Sigmaringen (Germany).

Tsujimura, K. (1970). Martin Heideggers Denken und die japanische Philosophie. Festrede zum 26. September 1969. In (Ed., der Stadt Meßkirch) *Ansprachen zum 80. Geburtstag am 26. September 1969 in Meßkirch*, 9-19. Meßkirch. Now in (ed H. Buchner) *Japan und Heidegger*, 159-165. Sigmaringen.

(1970). *Heidegger and Eastern Thought*. Monographic issue of *Philosophy East and West*, 20(3). Honolulu:

- Gray, J. G., Splendor of the simple, 229-246;
- Hirsch, E. F., Martin Heidegger and the East, 248-263;
- Umehara, T., Heidegger and Buddhism, 271 281.

Tsujimura, K. (1970). Zeugnis. In (ed., R. Wisser) *Martin Heidegger im Gespräch*, Freiburg - München (Germany) 1970, 27-29.

Tsujimura, K. (1971). Die Wahrheit des Seins und das absolute Nichts, en Ohashi (Ed. 1990) *Die Philosophie der Kyoto-Schule / Texte und Einführung*, 441-454. Freiburg Br. - München (Germany).

Chang, Ch.-Y. (1972). Pre-rational Harmony in Heidegger's Essential Thinking and Ch'an Thought. In *The Eastern Buddhist* V(2), 1972.

Schürmann, R. (1975). Trois penseurs de délaissement: Maître Eckhart, Heidegger, Suzuki. In *The journal of the History of Philosophy*, XII(4), 1974; 1, XIII, 1975; tr.

Ohashi, R. (1975). *Ekstase und Gelassenheit. Zu Schelling und Heidegger*, 86-178. München.

Kakihara, T. (1977). Wahrheit des Seins. Eine onto-theologische Frage von Martin Heidegger. In (Ed. D. Papenfuss - J. Söring) *Transzendenz und Immanenz. Philosophie und Theologie in der veränderten Welt*, 283-287, Stuttgart.

Tsujimura, K. (1976). Seinsfrage und absolutes Nichts — Erwachen», In (Ed. D. Papenfuss - J. Söring) *Transzendenz und Immanenz. Philosophie und Theologie in der veränderten Welt*, 289-301.

Stambaugh, J. (1976). Time-Being: East and West. In *The Eastern Buddhist*, X(2), 1976.

Steffney, J. (1977). Non-being Being versus non-being of Being. Heidegger's ontological difference with Zen Buddhism. In *The Eastern Buddhist*, X(2), 1977, 65-75.

Steffney, J. (1977). Transmetaphysical Thinking of Heidegger and Zen Buddhism. In *Philosophy East and West*, 27(3), 1977, 323-335.

Tsujimura, K. (1977). Andenken eines Japaners. In *Dem Andenken Martin Heideggers*, 60-61. Frankfurt am Main.

Tsujimura, K. (1977). Die Seinsfrage und absolutes Nichts — Erwachen. *In memoriam* Martin Heidegger. In (Ed., D. Papenfuss -J. Söring) *Transzendenz und Immanenz. Philosophie und Theologie in der veränderten Welt*, 289-301. Stuttgart.

Takeuchi, A. (1978). Ein Weg zu dem Selben in M. Heideggers Denken. Eine phänomenologische Analyse des Nichts. In *Philosophisches Jahrbuch*, 85(1), 1978.

Watanabe, J. (1979). Wahrheit und Unwahrheit oder Eigentlichkeit und Uneinentlichkeit: Eine Bemerkung zu Heideggers *Sein und Zeit*. In *Analecta Husserliana*, VIII: *Japanese Phenomenology*, 131-203. Dordrecht-Boston-London.

Tsujimura, K. (1980). Eine Bemerkung zu Heideggers *Aus der Erfahrung des Denkens*. In (Ed., Ute Guzzoni) *Nachdenken über Heidegger*. Hildesheim (Germany), 1980, 275-286.

Steffney, J. (1981). Man and Being in Heidegger and Zen Buddhism. In *Philosophy Today*, 25, 1981, 46-54.

Olson, C. (1981). The Leap of Thinking. A Comparison of Heidegger and the Zen Master Dogen. In *Philosophy Today*, 25, 1981, 46-54.
Steffney, J. (1981). Mind and Metaphysics in Heidegger and Zen Buddhism. In *The Eastern Buddhist*, 14 (1), 1981, 61-74.
Tsujimura, K. (1989). Zu “Gedachtes” von M. Heidegger. In *Philosophisches Jahrbuch*, 88, 1981, 316-332.
Pasqualotto, G. (1981). Oltre la tecnica: Heidegger e lo zen. In (1989), *Il Tao della filosofia*, 147-174. Parma (Italy).
Luther, A. R. (1982). Original Emergence in Heidegger and Nishida. *In Philosophy Today*, 26, 1982, 345-356.
Petzet, H. W. (1977). Die Bremer Freunde. In Neske, G. (Ed.) (1977).
Von Weizsäcker, C. F. (1977). Begegnungen in vier Jahrzehnten. In Neske, G. (Ed.) (1977).
Petzet, H. W. (1983). *Auf einen Stern zugehen. Begegnungen und Gespräche mit Martin Heidegger 1929-1976*. Frankfurt am Main.
Strolz, W (1984). Heideggers Entsprechung zum *Tao-Te-King* und Zen-Buddhismus. In (ed., Walter Strolz), *Sein und Nichts in der abendländischen Mystik*, 83-106. Freiburg Br.
Tsujimura, K. (1984). Zur Bedeutung von Heideggers “übergänglichem Denken” für die gegenwärtige Welt. In *Neue Hefte für Philosophie*, 23, Göttingen, 46-58.
Duval, J. E. (1984). *Heidegger et le zen*. Sisteron.
Joneda, M. (1984). *Gespräch und Dichtung. Ein Auseinandersetzungsversuch der Sprachauffassung Heideggers mit einem japanischen Sagen*. Frankfurt am Main.
Steffney, J. (1985). Nothingness and Death in Heidegger and Zen Buddhism. In *The Eastern Buddhist*, 18(1), 1985, 90-104.
Ikegami, T (1985). Der geschehende Sachverhalt in der japanischen Denkweise. In *Philosophisches Jahrbuch*, 92, 1985, 123 *et seq*.
Oshima, Y. (1985). *Zen — anders Denken? Zugleich ein Versuch über Zen und Heidegger*. Heidelberg.
Heine, S. (1985). Existential and Ontological Dimensions of Time in Heidegger and Dogen. Albany, NY.
Abe, M. (1985). The Problem of Time in Heidegger and Dogen. In (1992). *A Study of Dogen*, 107-144. Albany.
Stadt Meßkirch (Ed. 1985). *Heimat der Philosophie / Symposion 1985 anlässlich der Städtpartnerschaftsbesiegelung zwischen Meßkirch und Unoke als Geburtstädten von Martin Heidegger und Kitaro Nishida*. Meßkirch (Germany).
Jung, H. Y. (1986). The Piety of Thinking. Heidegger’s Pathway to Comparative Philosophy. In *Analecta Husserliana*, 21, 1986, 337-368.
Thompson, E. (1986). Planetary Thinking / Planetary Building. An Essay on M. Heidegger and Nishitani. In *Philosophy East and West*, 36, 1986), 235-252.
Stevens, B. (1986). Pratique du Zen et pensée de l’être. In *Revue philosophique de Louvain*, 84, 1986, 45-76.
Ohashi, R. (1986). Zur Philosophie der Kyoto-Schule. In *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* (40), 1986, 121-134.
Hempel, H. P. (1987/1992) Heidegger und Zen. Frankfurt am Main.
Parkes, G. (1987). Dogen / Heidegger / Dogen. A Review of Dogen Studies. In *Philosophy East and West*, 37, 1987, 437-454.

Parkes, G. (Ed., 1987) *Heidegger and Asian Thought*. Honolulu:
-Poggeler, O. West-East Dialogue — Heidegger and Lao-tzu, 47-78. Also in (1992). *Neue Wege mit Heidegger*, 387-425. Freiburg Br.
-Yuasa, Y. The Encounter of Modern Japanese Philosophy with Heidegger, 155-174;
-Takeichi, A. On the Origin of Nihilism — In View of the Problem of Technology and Karma, 175-185;
-Mizoguchi, K. Heidegger's Bremen Lectures: Towards a Dialogue with His Later Thought, 187-199. Now in (Ed., Ch. Macann, 1992) *Martin Heidegger*: *Critical Assessments*, I, 370-382. London.
-Kotoh, T. Language and Silence: Self-Inquiry in Heidegger and Zen, 201-211. Now in (Ed., Ch. Macann, 1992) *Martin Heidegger*: *Critical Assessments*, III, 39-49. London.
-Parkes, G. Afterwords — Language, 213-216.

Kawahara, M. E. (1987). Heideggers Auslegung der Langeweile. In (Ed., R. Wisser) *Martin Heidegger — Unterwegs im Denken*, 87-110. Freiburg Br. - München (Germany).

Cho, K. K. (1987). Bewusstsein und Natursein. Freiburg Br./ München (Germany).

Enns, A. (1988). The Subject-Object Dichotomy in Heidegger's *A Dialogue on Language* and Nishitani's *Religion and Nothingness*. In *Japanese Religions*, 15(1), 1988, 38-48.

May, R. (1989). Ex oriente lux / Heideggers Werk under ostasiatischem Einfluss. Wiesbaden. (English 1996). *Heidegger's Hidden Sources*. *East Asian Influences on His Work*. London.

Comolli, G. (1993). Il fiorire e lo svanire della parola. Su Heidegger, la poesia e alcuni motivi orientali. In *aut-aut*, 234, 1989, 119-142. Now in (1993). *Risonanze*, 1993, 133-159. Roma - Napoli (Italy).

(Ed., H. Buchner, 1989). Japan und Heidegger. Sigmaringen (Germany):
-Ohashi, R. Die Frühe Heidegger-Rezeption in Japan, 23-37;
-Weinmayr, E. Denken im Übergang — Kitaro Nishida und Martin Heidegger, 39-61;
-Tezuka, Tomio. Ein Stunde mit Heidegger, 173-179
-Tezuka, Tomio. Drei Antworten 179-180.
-Yuasa, Y. Kiyoshi Miki und Tetsuro Watsuji in der Begegnung mit der Philosophie Martin Heideggers, 63-78;
-Tsujimura, K. Ereignis und Shoki. Zur Übersetzung eines heideggerschen Grundwortes ins Japanische, 79-86;
-Buchner, H. Zur japanischen Heidegger-Gesamtausgabe, 237-244;
-Kawahara, E. Herzliches Beileid, 196.

(Ed., Th. Buchheim, 1989). *Desktruktion und Übersetzung* / *Zu den Aufgaben von Philosophiegeschichte nach Martin Heidegger*. Weinheim:
- Poggeler, O. Destruktion und Augenblick, 9-29;
- Kozuma, T. Technische Welt und anderer Anfang des Denkens, 63-76;
-Weinmeyr, E. Der “andere Anfang” im Zugleich verschiedener Zeiten und Welten, 77-84;
-Ohashi, R., «Heidegger und die Frage nach der abendländischen Moderne — ausgehend von einem Text Tschuang-Tses, 129-139;

-Sonoda, M. Wohnen die Ostasiaten in einem anderen “Haus des Sein”? Probleme einer Aufnahme Heideggers in japanisches Denken, 149-160;

-Heinz, M. Zur Problematik einer Aufnahme Heideggers in japanisches Denken, 161-170;

-Rombach, H. Die Seinsgeschichte als eine Epoche auf dem Wege der Menschheit. Versuch einer Ortung des Denkens von Martin Heidegger im Gesamthorizont der Kulturen, 171-176;

-Weinmeyr, E. Aspekte des Übersetzens zwischen Heidegger und Japan, 177-196.

Heine, S. (1990). Philosophy for an “Age of Death:” The Critique of Science and Technology in Heidegger and Nishitani. In *Philosophy East and West*, 40 (2), 1990, 175-193.

Nitta, Y. (1990). Der Weg zu einer Phänomenologie des Unscheinbaren. In (Ed., D. Papenfuss - O. Pöggeler, 1990). Zur philosophischen Aktualität Heideggers, 2, Frankfurt am Main.

Oshima, Y. (1990). Ein erhobener Finger von Meister Gutéi — Mit Heidegger unterweg zum Zen. In (Ed., P. Imhof, 1990). *Gottes Nähe* /*Religiöse Erfahrung in Mystik und Offenbarung*. Würzburg.

Stambaugh, J. (1991). Imaginary Dialogue between Heidegger and a Buddhist with Apologies for Possible Implausibilities of the Personalities. In *The Eastern Buddhist*, 24, 1991, 123-134.

Bilimoria, P, (1991). Heidegger and the Japanese Connection. In *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 22 (1), 1991, 3-20.

Ohashi, R., Heidegger und Graf Kuki. In (Ed., H.-H. Gander, 1991) *Von Heidegger her* / *Meßkircher Vorträge 1989*, 93-104. Frankfurt am Main.

Sinn, D. (1991). *Ereignis und Nirvana*: *Heidegger, Buddhismus, Mythos, Mystik*: *zur Archotypik des Denkens*. Bonn.

Weinmayr, Elmar (1991). *Enstellung*. *Die Metaphysik im Denken Martin Heideggers*: *mit einem Blick nach Japan*. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.

Parkes, G. (1992). Heidegger and Japanese Thought: How much did he Know and When did he Know it. In (Ed., Ch. Macann, 1992). *Martin Heidegger*: *Critical Assessments*, IV, 377-406. London.

Dallmayr, E. (1992). Nothingness and Sunyata: A Comparison of Heidegger and Nishitani. In *Philosophy East and West*, 42 (1), 1992, 37-48.

Ueda, Sh. (1992). The Place of Man in the Noh Play. In *The Eastern Buddhist*, 25, 1992, 59-88.

Vetsch, E. (1992). *Martin Heideggers Angang der interkulturellen Auseinandersetzung*, Würzburg.

McDermott, (1992). A Deeply Concealed Kinship: Heidegger and Zen. In Journal of Religious Studies, 18, 1992, 114-124.

(Ed., D. Papenfuss - O. Püggeler, 1992) *Zur philosophischen Aktualität Heideggers*, 3. Frankfurt am Main:

-Ogawa, T. Heideggers Übersetzbarkeit in ostasiatische Sprachen, 181-196;

-Mishima, K. Über eine vermeintliche Affinität zwischen Heidegger und dem ostasiatischen Denken, 325-341;

-Takeichi, A. Individuum und Welt, 342-356.

Hempel, H. P. (1993). *Heideggers Weg aus der Gefahr*. Meßikirch.

Zimmermann, M. E. (1993). Heidegger, Buddhism, and Deep Ecology. In AA. VV., The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger, 240-267. Cambridge.

(Ed. G. Stenger - M. Röhrig, 1995). *Philosophie der Struktur — "Fahrzeug" der Zukunft? Für Heinrich Rombach*. Freiburg - München:

-Pöggeller, O. Westliche Wege zu Nishida und Nishitani, 95-108;

-Oshima, Y (original 1990). Nähe und Ferne — Heideggers Begegnis mit Basho, 133-158.

R. Schürmann -J. D. Caputo (1995). Heidegger y la Mística. Córdoba (Spain).

Stevens, B. (1996). Situation de Nishida. In *Revue philosophique de Louvain*, 1, 1996, 43-68. Now in (2000). Topologie du Néant. Une approche de l'École de Kyôto. Louvain - Paris, 2000, 173--194.

Parkes, G. (1996). Rising Sun over Black Forest. In May, R., Heidegger's Hidden Sources: East Asian Influences on His Work, 79-117. London.

Stevens, B. (1996). Histoire de 1'être et nihilisme dans la perspective de l'école de Kyôto. In *Heidegger Studies*, 12, 57-82. Berlin. Now in (2000) *Topologie du Néant*. *Une approche de l École de Kyôto*, 143-172. Louvain - Paris.

Rothan, Ph. (1997). Pour 1'instauration de relations originelles entre le Japon et l'Europe. In *Heidegger Studies*, 13, 109-122. Berlin.

Wolz-Gottwald, E., (1997). Die Wendung nach Asien: Heideggers Ansatz interkultureller Philosophie. In *Prima Philosophia*, 10, 1997, 89-107.

Hartig, W, (1997). Die Lehre des Buddha und Heidegger: Beiträge zum Ost-West-Dialog des Denkens im 20. Jahrhundert. Forschungsberichte — Universität Konstanz, *Buddhistischer Modernismus*, 15, 1997.

Oshima, Y. (1998). *Nähe und Ferne*: *mit Heideggers unterwegs zum Zen*. Würzburg.

Tani, R., (1998). Inquiry into the Disclosedness, and Self-consciousness: Husserl, Heidegger, Nishida. In AA. VV., *Phenomenology in Japan*. Dordrecht - Boston - London.

Vetter, H., (1998). Die Nähe des späten Heidegger zum Buddhismus. In *Daseinanalyse*, 15, 1998, 17-26.

Yusa, M. (1998). Philosophy and Inflation: Miki Kiyoshi in Weimar Germany, 1922-1924. In *Monumenta Nipponica*, 53 (1), 1998, 45-71.

Arifuku, K., (1999). Die Antinomien von Techik und Umwelt: Heidegger und der Buddhismus. In *Deutsche Philosophie und Zen-Buddhismus*: *komparative Studien*, 167-183. Berlin.

Stevens, B. (2000). La thématique du nihilisme chez Heidegger et Nishitani. In (Dir., A. Berque, 2000) *Logique du lieu et dépassement de la modernité*, 1, 291-336. Brussels.

[1] It is well known that the initial philosophical elaboration of the project of modernity was carried our in its empiricist version by Francis Bacon, and in its rationalist version by René Descartes. Later on positivism gave a different expression to it, and the same did the grand systems of modernity, among which the most renowned are Hegel's and Marx's. In general, almost all philosophers of the modern era (with exceptions such as Georges Sorel and a few others) elaborated different versions of the myth in question.

[2] The assertion that the Madhyamaka may involve positing "autonomous" theses and syllogisms does not imply that the present book is written from the standpoint of the Madhyamaka Swatantrika (Tib. Uma Ranggyupa [*dbu ma rang rgyud pa*]) school. In fact, the Inner, Subtle Madhyamaka (Tib. Nang trawai uma (*nang phra ba'i dbu ma*) in general and the Mahamadhyamaka (Tib. Uma chenpo [*dbu ma chen po*]) School in particular, just like the Dzogchen teachings, reject the Swatantrika views on voidness of self-existence and so on, and coincide with those of the Madhyamaka Prasangika (Uma Thalgyurpa [*dbu ma thal 'gyur pa*])—and yet they posit "autonomous" theses and syllogisms. However, they make it clear that they do not do so as "interior-directed assertions" (Tib. *rang rgyud du khes len pa*) or assertions the propounder believes, but as what the Prasangikas call "other-directed" or "exterior-directed assertions" (Tib. *gzhan ngo khas len*) or assertions the propounder does not believe, making them as skillful means to lead others on the Path.

The *Prajñaparamitashastra*, unlike the texts conforming the *Collection of Madhyamika Reasonings* (Skt. *Yuktikaya*; Tib. *Rigtsog* [*rigs tshogs*] or *Uma rigtsog* [*dbu ma rigs tshogs*]), which are universally attributed to Nagarjuna, posits some autonomous theses and syllogisms, and some of its views seem to some extent similar to those of the Madhyamika Swatantrikas. However, the text in question makes it very clear that whatever an Awake individual posits is posited without what Chandrakirti called "own-mind" and as an "other-directed" or "exterior-directed assertion:" the Awake individual does not believe what He or She says, but says it as an expedient means for leading sentient beings of specific capacities to Awakening. This is a view rejected by the Swatantrikas and accepted both by the Prasangikas and the adherents of the Inner, Subtle Madhyamaka (Tib. Nang trawai uma [*nang phra ba'i dbu ma*]), and in particular by the Mahamadhyamikas. Thus despite the fact that it is not easy to assess the authenticity or unauthenticity of the *Prajñaparamitashastra*, one thing is certain with regard to it: it was not concocted by late followers of the Madhyamika Swatantrika subschool.

Nagarjuna's *Collection of Madhyamika Reasonings* (Skt. *Yuktikaya*; Tib. *Rigtsog* [*rigs tshogs*] or *Uma rigtsog* [*dbu ma rigs tshogs*]) is seen as the source of Swabhava Shunyata Madhyamaka or Uma Rangtongpa, which comprises the Madhyamaka Prasangika and Madhyamaka Swatantrika schools, whereas Nagarjuna's *Collection of Eulogies* (Skt. *Stavakaya*; Tib. Tötsog [*bstod tshogs*]) and in particular the *Eulogy to the Expanse of the True Condition* (Skt. *Dharmadhatustava*; Tib. Chöjing Töpa [*chos dbyings bstod pa*]) is seen as the source of the Inner, Subtle Madhyamaka (Tib. Nang trawai uma (*nang phra ba'i dbu ma*), which comprises the Parashunya Madhyamaka or Uma Zhentongpa (*dbu ma gzhan stong pa*) and the Mahamadhyamaka schools. Tibetans do not include the *Prajñaparamitashastra* in any of these two categories insofar as the book is not included in the Tibetan Buddhist Canons; however, if the work were truly by Nagarjuna, it could perhaps be seen as the source of *some of the views* of the Madhyamaka Swatantrika. However, insofar as it combines autonomous theses and syllogisms with the insistence that no thesis should be clung to, and that Awake Ones posit theses without own-mind, merely as other-directed assertions that may be useful to treaders of the Path, it could be seen also as one of the sources of Mahamadhyamaka. In fact, in this case the *Collection of Madhyamika Reasonings* as it is known and conserved in Tibet would be mainly the source of Prasangika.

Hui-neng's method of interrelated opposites (described in Capriles, 2004 and others of my works), which is at the root of many intellectual skillful means of Ch'an and Zen Buddhism, insofar as it is based on the

understanding that Buddhas have no own-mind and all they say are other-directed assertions having the function of leading beings to Awakening, would be based, among other sources, both in the *Collection of Madhyamika Reasonings* and in the *Prajñaparamitashastra*.

[3] Venkata Ramanan (1966) writes:

The understanding that is the consummate point of criticism is appreciative of the unique nature and value of every specific standpoint, and yet is not confined to any point of view. This is a comprehensive understanding inclusive of the several standpoints on the same level as well as of the different levels of understanding. Levels and perspectives need to be distinguished and this distinction needs to be appreciated as a relative distinction and not an absolute division. This comprehensive understanding is sought to be conveyed in the philosophy of the Middle Way by *prajña*... (p. 40)

The rejection of views which is an essential point in the philosophy of the Middle Way means that no specific view, being a view, is ultimate. The ultimate truth is not any "view." "Silence is the ultimate truth for the wise (*Sarvopalambhopashamah prapañchopashamah shivah; na kwachit kasyachit kashchit dharmo buddhena deshitah*: *Karika*, XXV:24)." And yet, the ultimate truth can be and needs to be expressed from the mundane standpoint. (p. 41)

...*drishti* (view) itself could be either wrong (*mithya*) or right (*samyak*) depending on whether it is clinging or free from clinging... [However, in the above passage, as always when] *drishti* [is] not qualified by *samyak*... [it] stands for false or wrong view. (p. 342, note 92)

To conclude, it must be noted that the *Atharvagiyasutra* (quoted in the *Prajñaparamitashastra*, 60c-61a; translation in Venkata Ramanan, 1966, pp. 128-129) reads:

Everyone takes stand on his own view and by his own constructions gives rise to disputes; "To know this is to know the truth," he holds, "and not to know this is to be condemned."

[Truly] one who does not accept the view of another is devoid of wisdom. He who clings to his own construction is devoid of wisdom.

To stand on one's own view of truth and give rise to false constructions, if this is pure wisdom, then there is none who does not have it.

[4] This seems to be so only in the case of European civilization and its offshoots, for traditional societies often had a healthy view of human evolution and history as a process of degeneration propelled by the development of basic human delusion, and of technology as something humankind should refrain from producing, for to do so would exacerbate this development. In the *Chuang-tzu*, a peasant tells a Taoist sage he plans to develop an irrigation system, and the sage advises him to abstain from so doing, as it would initiate a spiral of such developments leading to chaos and self-destruction. In Tibet and in the Andean plateau the wheel was known (in Tibet it was used in prayer wheels, and even in automated ones moved by the water of mountain streams, and in the Andes it was used in toys for children), yet its technological usages were prohibited. The Greeks, the Jews and the Sufis had their respective myths warning against the development of technology, which will be discussed in Part III of this book.

[5] Since the initial use of the term in Sorel (2a Ed. 1922), myth was for our author a network of meanings and a tool of elucidation helping us to perceive our own history. In particular, Sorel's "theory of social myths" establishes that myth is a human-originated belief born out of a psychological shock and—insofar as it must move human beings to action on the basis of an exemplary genealogy—often related to the question of origins. Rather than remitting to the past as the primitivists believed, it points to the eternal. It consists in a set, not of concepts or ideas, but of motive images, and hence the point is nor whether or not it does respond to whatever happened, but that it must give rise, intuitively and prereflectively, to the whole of the feelings susceptible of giving rise to an envisaged action: it has to do with what will be produced and what one intends to produce, even though it is not a precise prediction. If it is fruitful, if it responds to the collective aspirations, if it is accepted by the whole of society or at least by a sizeable part of it, the myth renews itself on the basis of itself: its socialization corresponds to its consecration. Hence myth is beyond such disjunctives as true-false, good-evil, just-unjust: either it is fruitful, generating a socio-psychological activity, or it is not fruitful and does not generate such activity. This, among other things, is why Sorel denounces the implicit reductionism of Marxism and its pretension of scientifically predicting the future, yet rather than refuting the system in question, limits himself to asserting that it pretends itself scientific insofar as science is the pivotal myth of its time: Marxism is mythic precisely to the extent to which it pretends itself scientific. This is why Sorel (1906) asserts that the true problem does not lie in conceiving precepts or even examples, but in setting into action the forces susceptible of causing action to adjust itself to the precepts and examples. Unlike Pareto, Sorel does not view myth as an irrational belief we

must rid ourselves of, but as a motor or instigator to be implemented—so long as the myth be "authentic" in the sense of leading to a desirable state of affairs. This is why Sorel (1908), just as this book, insists that "progress" is nothing but a myth of the bourgeoisie—which, it is now clear, has led us the brink of self-destruction.

The myth I present in the three volumes of this book, and particularly in vol. III, *Beyond History*, is intended as a means, not only toward the transformation of society, but also toward going beyond "adhering" (to myths and all sorts of constructions of thought) in the sense of "being conditioned by"—and thus toward achieving freedom with regard to that which causes myths to have a motive power. In other words, just like Ashvagosha advocated the use of language as a means toward going beyond language, in this book I am laying out a myth that I intend to ultimately cause myths to lose their motive power. In fact, according to the view of human evolution and history presented in vol. III, our species went from a condition in which human beings were not conditioned by myths and thought constructions in general, to one in which they were so conditioned and hence wholesome myths were employed. Finally, from the latter it moved to a condition in which harmful myths were adopted that pretended to be objective, "scientific" descriptions of reality rather than myths.

(It must be noted that my coincidence with Sorel in the above regards should not be taken to imply I accept his extreme apology of violence.)

[6] I elucidated the various systems of Buddhist philosophy in Capriles (2004)—the revised and corrected version of which will appear in book form as soon as I have time to prepare it. I elucidated the structure and function of the Path of Dzogchen (*rdzogs chen*) Atiyoga and its relation to other Buddhist Paths in Capriles (2003), which is an expanded and revised version of the first of the three chapters of Capriles (2000a)—and which I will revise and correct as soon as I have time to do so, after which it will appear in book form. I further elucidated the structure and function of the Path of Dzogchen Atiyoga in the second and third of the three chapters of Capriles (2000a), which I will re-elaborate for them to become the next two volumes in the series in which the revised and corrected version of Capriles (2003) will be the first volume.

[7] It must be noted that the fact that in this book I contradict Dr Herbert V. Guenther, Dr Giuseppe Tucci and other Buddhologists and Tibetologists does not mean that I fail to appreciate the enormous value of their work. In particular, Dr. Guenther was one of the very few Western scholars included in the dedication of Capriles (1977), for I wanted to honor and express my gratitude to one of the Western translators and authors who did the most for diffusing the Dzogchen teachings and whose publications were a gold mine to non-Asians who, like myself, had become genuinely interested in Buddhism in general and Dzogchen in particular; his translations, explanations and notes gave many of us the initial information on Dzogchen that led us to seek the Masters, study with them and devote ourselves wholeheartedly to the practice. However, since Dr. Guenther's attempts to explain Dzogchen in terms of the philosophy of Martin Heidegger absolutely distort the Dzogchen teachings, I have tried to explain most clearly the nature of these distortions. Something similar applies to Dr Tucci, who diffused most precious information on the connections between different spiritual traditions in Zhang-zhung and was instrumental for the establishment of Chögyal Namkhai Norbu in the West. However, as this master has noted, it is time to revert Dr Tucci's interpretation of the *direction* in which spiritual influences moved in the Himalayan region.

The other Buddhologists and Tibetologists I have contradicted in this and other books, either directly or indirectly, are my *vajra* brothers. In fact, they sat together with me and many others in most of the long series of Empowerments that both H. H. the late Dudjom Jigdräl Yeshe Dorje and H. H. the late Dilgo Khyentse gave in the second half of the nineteen-seventies; some times also in a shorter series of Empowerments given by Dodrub Chen Rinpoche, and in some cases also in teachings and/or Empowerments transmitted by Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche, Dungse Thinle Norbu Rinpoche, H. H. Pema Norbu, Chadräl Sangye Dorje Rinpoche and/or other Masters. Furthermore, in the last decades some of them have been studying under Chögyal Namkhai Norbu. Therefore, I have a *samaya* with them, and hence by no means should I harbor the intention of discrediting them. However, I felt obliged to clarify the confusions generated by scholars, no matter who these scholars may be.

[8] Note that, though it was David Cooper (1967) who coined the term "antipsychiatry," and R. D. Laing never included himself in the category indicated by the word, I follow the custom—initiated, according to Adrian Laing (1996), in the Introduction to Cooper (Ed. 1968) (and maintained in such works as Boyers & Orrill [Eds. 1971])—of including R. D. Laing in it.

[9] *Existenzphilosophie* and existentialism assert anguish and other unpleasant states to be more authentic than those states that are produced through the elusion of these unpleasant states. In its turn, the term *metaexistential* refers to any philosophical system that, in agreement with *Existenzphilosophie* and existentialism, acknowledge that anguish and other unpleasant states are more authentic than those states that are produced through the avoidance of anguish and other unpleasant states, but which show that the unpleasant states in question, insofar as they are inherent in the naked experience of ego-delusion, are spurious with regard to the absolute Truth represented by the dissolution of ego-delusion in *nirvana* or Awakening.

Furthermore, Jean-Paul Sartre (1982), defined existentialism as the doctrine according to which existence precedes essence. The metaexistential view does not accept either that existence precedes essence or that essence precedes existence, but explains existence and essence as co-emerging developments. For a longer discussion of the term "metaexistential," see Chapter V in Part II / Volume II of this book.

[10] Originally, I intended the contents of Volumes I and II of this work to be part of a more extensive book dealing with psychology and phenomenology from the standpoint of Buddhism and Dzogchen, which was to be called *Beyond Being*, *Beyond Mind*, and which would include and develop the contents of the chapters on psychology and metaexistential metaphenomenology (concepts explained in subsequent notes) in Capriles (1977) and Capriles (1986), as well as the contents of papers such as Capriles (1997a) (involving serious typesetting errors that absolutely distorted its meaning) and Capriles (1999a) (which, after being translated into English, revised and expanded, became Capriles [2000c]). Having been asked to contribute a paper for vol. 20 of the *IJTS*, I set out to condense the contents of one of the chapters on phenomenology I was preparing for the above-mentioned, more extensive book. However, the new paper progressively grew to cover the scope of the other chapters as well, and so it became clear that what I was writing included all materials dealing with phenomenology in the above-mentioned book, and that its length was that of a book rather than that of an article. Then, when I received a copy of vol. 19 of the *IJTS*, I realized that the editors had made changes to Capriles (2000c), which were intended to improve the English, but which distorted the sense of the term rangdröl (*rang grol*), which at the time I was rendering as "self-liberation" (it was in order to avoid misunderstandings like the one this rendering gave rise to in the former editors of the *IJTS* that now I translate this term as "spontaneous liberation"). Worried that the reading of my previous paper could give rise to misconceptions regarding rangdröl, I decided to prepare a wholly different paper for vol. 20 of the *IJTS* (Capriles [2001]) discussing the meaning of this term, and including the archetypal samsaric loops described in my book on the practice of Tekchö in the context of the Nyingthik, Capriles (1990a), yet excluding the instructions for practice featured in that book, and decided to turn the paper originally intended for vol. 20 of the *IJTS* into a book—which is the one the reader is reading right now.

As I proceeded with the work, it became apparent that, were this book to include the materials touching on various fields of psychology and so-called "sexology" from Capriles (1977, 1986), it would become too voluminous, and besides it would take too long to complete it. Hence I decided to exclude them from it, while keeping my critique of transpersonal psychology from the standpoint of Buddhism and Dzogchen, which was more closely connected with the rest of the contents of the book (I plan to some day turn the contents of the chapters in question into a new book in English dealing exclusively with various fields of psychology, provided that I find the time).

Then, when the work seemed to be nearly ready, I realized that, since it dealt with transpersonal and integral philosophy and psychology, it was a suitable place for denouncing Ken Wilber's progress-oriented view of phylogeny as corresponding to ontogenesis. And since this denunciation would only make sense in the context of my Dzogchen-based philosophy of history, I summarized the corresponding sections of Capriles (1994a), which then I contrasted with Wilber's views on phylogeny, giving rise to Part III of this book. At this point it seemed to me that it would be appropriate to include in this new part of the book a discussion of so-called "postmodern" philosophy, and to establish in it the true meaning of the much discussed "end of history." As a result of this the book now also deals with a philosophy of history that calls for the surpassing of history; therefore, I added the phrase *Beyond History* to the original title, and made the necessary adjustments to its subtitle.

At the end, I had to rewrite the introduction so that it would fit the final structure and contents of the book. Likewise, realizing that chapter IV, which previously was the first chapter of vol. II, involved a higher degree of abstraction than the rest of that volume and therefore could become an impediment for readers not specialized in philosophy, I decided to move it to vol. I, of which it became the last chapter (this

being the reason why the book has Part II: Beyond Mind I and Part III: Beyond Mind II). This would allow readers versed in psychology but not trained in philosophy to proceed through vol. II with greater ease, rather than possibly giving up after finding the first chapter not to make a pleasant reading.

[11] For a definition and discussion of these terms, the corresponding adjectives and all related terms, cf. the section "Metaphenomenology and the Metaontology" in Chapter II of this book.

[12] I am not using the term "metapsychology" in the Freudian sense, but in order to refer to "a psychology not limited to the functioning of mind, but also dealing with the dynamic of going beyond mind."

[13] The term *metatranspersonal* refers to psychological systems that, unlike most modern Western systems of psychology and like transpersonal psychology, do not regard transpersonal states as being pathological, but which, unlike transpersonal psychology, make it clear that mental health cannot be reduced to the attainment of indeterminate transpersonal states. The ideal, true aim of psychological therapy must be to allow disturbed individuals to overcome coarse disturbances, so that should they wish to do so they may successfully practice the methods of Wisdom traditions, and the ideal, true aim of spiritual practice, rather than being the attainment of transpersonal states *per se*, must lie in eradicating (1) the unawareness that, as will be shown later on in the main text of this book, corresponds to the first of the three senses the terms *avidya* and marigpa (*ma rig pa*) have in the threefold classification chosen here, and (2) the basic delusion that, as will be shown below in the regular text of this book, corresponds to the second and third of the three senses the terms *avidya* and marigpa have in the threefold classification chosen here. This will be considered in Part II of this book, and was considered in the papers mentioned in note 10 (Capriles [1999a, 2000c]).

By speaking of "metatranspersonal psychology" I am not calling for the birth of a new psychological movement: the psychology of genuine Wisdom traditions is metatranspersonal, and the shift of emphasis I want to see in transpersonal psychology is one that would make it become like the psychology of those genuine Wisdom traditions of the East which discriminate between samsaric, delusive transpersonal experiences, neither-samsaric-nor-nirvanic transpersonal states, and the transpersonal state of Supreme Sanity corresponding to Awakening or Enlightenment. Though the psychology of genuine Wisdom traditions was always metatranspersonal, as we are told in Shapiro (1986), this psychology has been neglected by Western psychologists. Shapiro writes (pp. 10-11):

"While some American psychologists, especially those specializing on cross-cultural psychology or transpersonal psychology, have begun to explore the vast psychological resources inherent in Asian cultures, these psychologists remain a very small minority, and the richness and depths of classical Asian psychology has been more adequately mined by scholars in Asian religion and philosophy."

Even though I am calling for transpersonal psychology to become metatranspersonal, in Shapiro & Castillo, (1986/1987), it is apparent that often psychologists bearing the label "transpersonal" developed systems that, at least in some important respects, may be said to be metatranspersonal.

[14] Therefore, in both cases the prefix "meta" means that we must go beyond a specific error: in the case of the term "metatranspersonal" it means that we must go beyond the error of positing transpersonal states as an aim *per se*; in the case of the term "metapostmodern" it makes the point that we must go beyond the twofold error lying in [1] barring grand narratives, and [2] asserting that we have transcended modernity, for modernity will only be truly surpassed when the primordial condition be restored and, consequently, we go beyond progress and all that has developed throughout the present time cycle—which in its turn is the condition of possibility for the survival of our species and the initiation of an age of Communion, socioeconomic and political equality, plenitude in frugality, and collaboration with the rest of the ecosphere.

[15] Morris West is the novelist who specialized in Vatican stories; however, it was through his novel *The Ambassador* that I became aware of the existence of Zen Buddhism—as a result of which I set out to search for books on the subject through Caracas bookstores. This search was fruitless, but one night I had a puncture, and as I got out of the car I found the Spanish version of Chang Chen Chi's *The Practice of Zen* lying on a wall. Though nowadays I deem this book to be one of the best works on Ch'an/Zen, at the time I opened the book in a page telling the story of a Zen master who, after announcing his imminent death, stood on his head and died; since this seemed too magical to my agnostic mentality of the time, at that point I abstained from reading it—which I did after I returned from the East in 1983.

[16] Mainly Watts, Alan W. 1975a, but also some of his other books.

[17] In particular, Jung's pioneering Psychological Commentaries to Tibetan Dzogchen texts (1928, 1954) and discussions of the *mandala* principle (1968, 1972)—all of which involve different inexactitudes yet were very important in the initial stages of my formation.

[18] I am referring to the pioneering work: Fromm, Suzuki & De Martino (1960).

[19] I am also indebted to Fritjof Capra, some of whose books (1982, 1988, 1996) provided me with a mine of useful information, from which I dug a considerable amount of material—but which I did not mention in the regular text of the Introduction as an early influence on my thought because by the time these books were published my views had already been formed. Likewise, the original 1975 edition of Capra (1983) was so important for me that it inspired an appendix to Capriles (1977) and was one of the sources for a chapter of Capriles (1986) and an appendix to Capriles (1994a). Furthermore, much earlier, at the time of deciding what to study at the University, I had considered studying physics because Watts (1969) had given me the idea of attempting roughly what later on Capra did in his famed book—and which later on several others continued to do (among the many well-known works on the subject, suffice to mention: Zukav [1979]; LeShan [1982]; Bentov [1977], Bentov & Bentov [1982]; Wilber [Ed. 1982, Ed. 1984]; Ricard & Thuan [2004]—and indirectly Bohm & Hiley [1975], and Bohm [1976, 1980, 1982].)

[20] Professor Cappelletti was also instrumental in widening my knowledge of and increasing my fondness for the political theories of nonviolent left-wing anarchism. Both he and professor Eichler were also fond of Buddhism and, in general, of Eastern thought.

[21] Lit. the "three turnings of the wheel of the doctrine." The concept of "three Promulgations" came to us through the *Samdhinirmochanasutra*, taught in the Third Promulgation.

[22] This is the contradiction that makes it impossible for sentient beings to attain plenitude and satisfaction. In fact, as will be shown in the regular text upon considering the Second Noble Truth, so long as we remain under the illusion of being substantial entities, separate from the rest of the indivisible totality that is our true condition, the totality that we (are) in truth—which is a continuum of plenitude—will continue to be illusorily fractured in our experience: so long as we experience ourselves as the illusory mental subject that occupies no space whatsoever and which seems to be at a distance from the universal continuum we will experience lack of the plenitude of that continuum and, in general, what the Buddha called *duhkha*. The contradiction lies in the fact that so long as we experience ourselves as separate selves, we have the compulsion to affirm and try to maintain our existence as such, and hence through all of our attempts to reach plenitude and satisfaction we maintain the illusion of separateness and selfhood that bars us from attaining them.

[23] This Third Truth is often stated as "stopping the causes (which are the karmas), the effects cease:" when this happens *nirvana* manifests, which according to the *Theravada* is the only unconditioned and unmade (*asamskrita*) *dharma*, but which is not a mere annihilation (and which, as we all know, does not involve the extinction of human life). In fact, many texts illustrate *nirvana*, which is not simply nonbeing (it is qualified as *not nonbeing*), with the image of a flame that seems to go out, but which in reality, rather than being annihilated, through entering pure space (*akasha*) disappears from view. *Hinayana* Buddhism in general posits two types of *nirvana*: with a residue of condition, called *sopadhishesha nirvana*, which is obtained during one's lifetime, and without a residue of condition or *nirupadhishesha nirvana*, which is obtained posthumously. The former is the transition to another dimension, not in the sense of going beyond our world, but of continuing to live and yet experiencing the world (so to speak, for the concept of experience does not apply here) in a totally new way, utterly beyond *duhkha* and its cause (which according to all forms of Hinayana Buddhism is the basic thirst called *trishna*, but which, as we have seen, according to the Mahayana is the basic human delusion called *avidya*).

Albert Schweitzer [1957] classified Buddhism as a life denying religion. Such characterization would only be to some extent valid with regard to Sutric Buddhism in general and Hinayana Buddhism in particular, not for the reasons why Schweitzer characterized Buddhism in general as such, but because these systems view the human organism and its drives as untrustworthy. It must be noted, however, that Schweitzer's view of Buddhism was nonetheless positive, because he claimed Shakyamuni "…gave expression to truths of everlasting value and advanced the ethics of not India alone but of humanity. Buddha was one of the greatest ethical men of genius ever bestowed upon the world"

[24] The Dzogchen teachings designate the state free from delusion in which the nondual primordial gnosis of awareness reGnizes its own face (rangngo shepa [*rang ngo shes pa*]), so that it becomes perfectly patent, by the Tibetan term rigpa (*rig pa*), corresponding to the Sanskrit *vidya*—which I translate sometimes as Truth (in the sense of absence of error or delusion), sometimes as nondual Presence or instant Presence,

sometimes as nondual Awake awareness. Though sometimes I speak of nondual Awake awareness *qua* Base, *qua* Path and *qua* Fruit, or of Primordial Gnosis *qua* Base, *qua* Path and *qua* Fruit, in Tibetan the Dzogchen teachings refer to what I am calling nondual Awake awareness *qua* Base by terms such as changchubsem (*byang chub sems*; Skt. *bodhichitta*) or semnyi (*sems nyid*; Skt. *chittata* or *chitta-eva*), etc. which are often translated as "nature of mind," and they reserve the term rigpa for what here I am calling nondual Awake awareness-*qua*-Path and nondual Awake awareness-*qua*-Fruit.

Avidya and marigpa (*ma rig pa*) are terms composed by (1) a privative prefix (the Sanskrit *a* and the Tibetan *ma*) and (2) the words that in the context of the Dzogchen teaching I have been translating as Truth (in the sense of absence of error or delusion), nondual, instant Presence and nondual Awake awareness. This is due to the fact that the most basic manifestation of *avidya* or marigpa is the basic unawareness of the true nature of the Base in which Awake awareness is obscured and which is the first of the three types of *avidya* in the threefold classification chosen here, which will be discussed below in the regular text of this chapter (and in greater detail in a note to that discussion), but which also underlies the active delusion at the root of *samsara* (consisting in the second type of *avidya*, which involves dualism and a confusion of categories, but normally involving also the third, which consists in ignoring delusion to be such).

In the teaching of the Four Noble Truths (*arya-satya*) of the First Promulgation, associated with the *Hinayana*, the Second Noble Truth, which is that of the cause (*samudaya*) of suffering, is said to be *trishna*, which in this context has the sense of "craving." However, as shown in the regular text, *Mahayana*, *Vajrayana*, and *Atiyogatantrayana* interpretations of the Noble Truths, in agreement with the chain of causal origination of the *pratitya samutpada*, establish that *trishna* derives from *avidya*—which here must be understood as involving the three main senses the term has in the threefold classification chosen here and therefore as a delusion or error, the condition of possibility of which is the unawareness of the true nature or essence of all reality that is the first of the types of *avidya*. In fact, craving and desire come from the illusion that we lack something that would be necessary for us to feel whole—or, in other words, from *avidya qua* delusion, which introduces an illusory cleavage into the completeness and plenitude of our true condition, making us experience a lack-of-completeness-that-demands-to-be-filled or lack-of-plenitude-that-demands-to-be-filled.

The above are the senses of the terms *trishna* and *avidya* when they refer to divergent interpretations of the Second Noble Truth. However, in other general Buddhist teachings these two terms are given more specific meanings; in particular, they are also used to refer to two of the three main defilements which, according to Buddhism in general, occur in *samsara*, and which are called the three "roots of unwholesomeness" (*akushala*): (1) *dwesha* or aversion; (2) *trishna*, which here has the particular sense of avidity and desire as different from the other two main defilements; and (3) *avidya*, understood as mental obfuscation and bewilderment and therefore also as different from the other two main defilements.

(In the Tibetan term marigpa, the negative prefix is not the one that is used in normal categorical negation. In Guenther [1984], p. 219, footnote 9, we are reminded that the Sanskrit term *ahimsa* [nonviolence] is translated into Tibetan as tsewa mepa [*'tshe ba med pa*] and that the rest of those terms that imply a categorical negation are translated by adding the term mepa. The fact that marigpa [*ma-rig-pa*] implies something categorically different from rigpa-mepa [*rig-pa med-pa*] is something that Khenpo Nülden [*mkhan po nus ldan*] underlines in his *mkhas 'jug mchan 'grel*, a commentary on the *mkhas-'jug* by Jamgön Ju Mipham Gyamtso [*'jam mgon 'ju mi pham rgya mtsho*]. The same thing, however, does not occur with the Sanskrit term *avidya*, which has the same structure as *ahimsa*—which shows that, as will be remarked in a subsequent chapter, translations produced during the Nyingma [*rnying ma*] diffusion of the *Dharma* are often more precise than the original texts on which they are based.)

[25] The reader should keep in mind that the meaning of the term "delusion" is different from that of the word "illusion." By "illusion" I designate, for example, the perception of a falling hair by one who suffers from cataracts, the apprehension of a shell as yellow by one suffering from jaundice, the vision of a gigantic snow ball in the Sahara, the perception of something bidimensional as being tridimensional, etc. On the other hand, "delusion" implies confusion and may consist in believing that an illusion, rather than being an illusion, has actuality—or in taking the relative as absolute, the interdependent as independent, what we value as intrinsically valuable, etc.

[26] For example, the *Madhyamika Prasangika* view in this regard is that the root of *samsara* (i.e. of cyclic existence) is the basic delusion called *avidya* or marigpa (*ma rig pa*); that this delusion is of two types, namely the misconception and delusory experience of the nature and status of the person and the

misconception and delusory experience of the nature and status of phenomena other than the person (the second category includes the aggregates that interact in the production of the misconception and delusory experience of the nature of the person); that the misconception and delusory experience of the nature of the person depends on the misconception and delusory experience of the nature of the aggregates (which as just noted are themselves phenomena-that-are-not-persons); and that this does not imply that there are two roots of cyclic existence, for both misconceptions and delusory experiences are exactly the same in nature—which this school explains as a conception and experience of self-existence, where there is no such mode of existence.

However, according to the Madhyamika Swatantrikas, the misconception and delusory experience of the nature of the person and the misconception and delusory experience of the nature of phenomena other than persons are not exactly the same in nature. Furthermore, they make a distinction between the root of cyclic existence, which is the conception of a self in persons, and the final root of cyclic existence, which is the conception of a self in phenomena.

In terms of the teachings of Dzogchen *Ati*, the misconception and delusory experience of *all* types of phenomena as existing inherently is a function of the delusory valuation of thought (which I explain briefly in this chapter), in interaction with a series of mental functions. (I excuse myself with Professor Ian Woodword, who advised me to reduce the repetition of phrases in this note, but I opted for clarity in detriment of style.)

[27] As will be seen in Part III of this book, my references to contemporary physics are not intended to imply that in the twentieth century physics definitively elucidated the nature and structure of the universe. In fact, in the chapter in question I expand some of the arguments I used in Capriles (1994a), to show the “discoveries” of the sciences to be ideological in nature—and, in the opinion of some thinkers, to be more than ideologies, for they are the very matrix that make possible the existence of power (political, economic and so on).

Despite the warnings that the theories of present day physics could as well be replaced by others as a result of the progress of research and conceptual elaboration (just like those of nineteenth century physics changed radically in the twentieth century), the coincidences between contemporary physics and the world views of *Mahayana*, *Vajrayana* and *Atiyogatantrayana* forms of Buddhism (discussed in many works including Capra [1983]; Capriles [1977, 1986, 1994a]; Zukav [1979]; LeShan [1982]; Bentov [1977], Bentov & Bentov [1982]; Wilber [Ed. 1982, Ed. 1984]; Ricard & Thuan [2004]—and indirectly Bohm & Hiley [1975], and Bohm [1976, 1980, 1982]), provided that we don’t take them to be a final and objective truth, may be used as provisional, disposable antidotes to the beliefs of common sense.

[28] If we assume the realist hypothesis, we can explain this in terms of twentieth century physics, and note that according to Field Theory, the universe is a continuum of energy, and that as such (i.e. as something having no empty spaces) it may be categorized as absolute plenitude. In terms of this hypothesis, the Buddhist view would have to be explained by asserting that, since human consciousness is not a substance separate from the rest of totality, it is part of this continuum of plenitude—and that it is when the illusion that we are a consciousness separate from the energy field arises, that we experience lack of plenitude.

If we assume the idealist hypothesis, Field Theory, rather than describing a reality external to and different from experience, would be describing the nature of our experience, which the physicist takes for a reality external to and independent from experience. In this case, the above explanation applies as well, with the sole exception that the continuum of plenitude that as a mental subject we feel at a distance from would have to be characterized as “mental.”

Finally, should we refuse, in view of the limits inherent in human knowledge, to adopt either the realist’s or the idealist’s hypothesis, the same would apply, with the sole difference that we will not characterize the continuum as either physical or mental. At any rate, it is when the whole is illusorily sundered that we experience the lack-of-wholeness that I categorized as “lack of plenitude.” For a longer discussion of this, see note 37 to this volume.

[29] This absolute completeness and plenitude is disrupted *in* our samsaric experience but not in absolute reality. Moreover, it is disrupted *by* our experience insofar as the term “experience” refers solely to *samsara*. In fact, the term derives from the Latin *ex-perire*, meaning “going out from inside” (or “dying from inside”) and therefore there can be no doubt that it implies the subject-object duality. Thinle Norbu (1997), pp. 3-4, writes:

"…it is not said in Buddhism that Buddha "experienced" Awakening. Awakening is beyond experience. Experience occurs between the duality of subject and object, and there is no existence of subject and object in Awakening. Experience comes from feeling, and feeling belongs to sentient beings, not to fully Awake Buddhas. Awakening is completely beyond either feeling or numbness.

"From the point of view of the causal vehicle (*hetuyana*), it can be said that bodhisattvas, sublime beings who are on the Path of Awakening and have not yet attained Buddhahood, still have experience due to traces of the residue of previous habit. Therefore, it could be said that when Buddha took birth many times as a bodhisattva before attaining Awakening, he had experience, including the experience of suffering caused by the passions, which he later taught about when he attained the omniscience of fully Awake Buddhahood. But this explanation of experience can only be made from the point of view of the causal vehicle, in which bodhisattvas are differentiated from Buddhas. According to the resultant vehicle (*phalayana*), bodhisattvas are fully Awake manifestations of Buddhas effortlessly emanating for the benefit of beings and so they are also beyond experience, indivisible from the Wisdom-mind of Buddhas.

"According to the Buddhist point of view, experience is always connected with dualistic mind. Dualistic mind depends on the ordinary inner elements of sentient beings and ordinary outer elements of the [seemingly] substantial world, which are the basis of all that exists in duality. These ordinary elements are affected by inner root circumstances, such as the conditions of the [apparently] substantial world, which always rely on each other and always change. The experience of sentient beings is to continually react to the circle of manipulation between subject and object, inner and outer elements, and root (cause) and contributing circumstances, which all continuously change because they are occupied by the habit of duality. The object is unreliable because the subject is unreliable, like a mental patient who depends on a schizophrenic psychiatrist. Sometimes he may feel worse and sometimes better, but he cannot transcend his situation, because of endlessly circling between the subjective problems of the self and the [seemingly] objective problems of the other."

[30] Dzogchen translations often speak of recognizing thoughts as the *dharmakaya*, of recognizing the true condition, essence or nature of thoughts, and so on. In all such cases, what the texts are referring to is *not* what normally we understand for "recognition," which is the understanding of a pattern or collection of characteristics (Skt. *lakshana*; Tib. tsenpai [*mtshan dpe*]) in terms of a delusorily valued concept. It was in order to make clear the distinction between what the texts refer to, and what is usually termed "recognition," that I coined the neologisms "reGnition," "reGnize," and so on.

For some time I used the terms "reCognition," "reCognize" and so on, written with a capital C so that they could be distinguished from the terms "recognition," "recognize" and so on. However, this was far from ideal, insofar as "reCognition" (etc.) still contained the prefix "co," which implies the *co*-emergent arising of a subject and an object, for as Paul Claudel noted in his *Traité de la Co-naissance au monde et de soi-même* (in Claudel [1943]), knowledge (*connaissance*) involves the co-emergence (*co-naissance*) of subject and object—which implies that it is dualistic and delusive. I did away with the prefix "co" because in what I call "reGnition" the subject-object duality dissolves like feathers entering fire. (Claudel was speaking of knowledge in the Biblical sense and of co-emergence in general rather than of the co-emergent arising of the mental subject and its objects, but his statement applies even better to the latter event. He claimed that birth *qua* co-naissance, like time, occurs in Being, and that it forms a couple with Time.)

However, the neologisms "reGnition," reGnize" and so on are far from perfect, for the prefix "re" may convey the wrong idea that a new event called "Gnition" takes place each and every time that which I am calling "reGnition" occurs (just as, each and every time there is recognition, a new cognition takes place). This is not correct because, though reGnition is beyond doubt a Gnitive event, this event consists in the *unveiling* of the primordial Gnosis that is the true nature of thought and mental phenomena, and which neither arises not disappears. However, since all alternatives I considered were far more inadequate than the neologisms "reGnition," "reGnize" and so on, and since in practice there is new Gnitive event each and every time reGnition occurs, I decided to use these neologisms.

[31] Delusion involves attributing an enormous value and an enormous importance to some phenomena, a medium degree of value and importance to others, a very low one to still others, and no value or importance at all to yet others. Although nonpractitioners may think the last possibility is identical to the absence of the delusory valuation-absolutization of thought, this is incorrect, for it is a function of the subject-object duality that arises as a result of the delusory valuation-absolutization of the super-subtle thought structure called the threefold thought-structure, and which involves the subject's indifference to

the object (in fact, it is relative to the different degrees of value and importance that we attribute to different phenomena).

[32] The first of the three meanings of the terms *avidya* and *ma rig pa* in the threefold classification chosen here is that of unawareness of the true nature of the Base induced by the manifestation of a contingent, beclouding element of stupefaction (mongcha [*rmongs cha*]) that obscures *rig pa*'s inherent nondual self-awareness, preventing it from making patent *rig pa*'s own face in the manifestation of rigpa-*qua*-Path and rigpa-*qua*-Fruit. So long as this unawareness is manifest there can be no *nirvana*, for in *nirvana* the true nature of the Base is fully patent; however, by itself this unawareness cannot give rise to *samsara*, which would require the additional manifestation of *avidya* / *ma rig pa* in at least the second sense the terms have in the threefold classification chosen here —i.e. as the active delusion involving the dualistic appearances and the illusion of self-existence proper of *samsara*. In fact, *avidya* / *ma rig pa qua* the unawareness corresponding to the first of the senses the terms have in the Dzogchen teachings initially manifests in a condition in which neither *nirvana* nor *samsara* is active, and continues to be manifest after *samsara* arises—at which point, however, it is accompanied by the second and third types of *avidya* or *ma rig pa*. The condition in which neither *nirvana* nor *samsara* is active is called "neutral (lungmaten [*lung ma bstan*]) condition of the base-of-all (kunzhi [*kun gzhi*]):" it is said to be neutral precisely because in it neither *nirvana* nor *samsara* is active (and thus may be compared to a gearbox in neutral, which does not make a car move either forward or backward). According to circumstances, the neutral condition of the base-of-all may be called: "primordial, profound base-of-all" (yedön kunzhi [*ye don kun gzhi*]); "dimension of the base-of-all" (kunzhi kham [*kun gzhi khams*]); or base-of-all carrying propensities (bagchagkyi kunzhi [*bag chags kyi kun gzhi*]).

The second type of *avidya* or *ma rig pa* in the threefold classification chosen here involves the confusion of categories referred to in the sentence in the regular text to which the reference mark for this note was appended, whereby the relative is taken to be absolute, the insubstantial is taken to be to be substantial, the dependent is taken to be self-existent, and so on. This type of *avidya* or *ma rig pa* comprises the manifestation of the grasper and the grasped (Tib. *'dzin gzung*): the subject-object duality and grasping at appearances (*phyin ci log par 'dzin pa*). It involves an inverted apprehension of the *given* insofar as the three aspects of the Base, which are ngowo (*ngo bo*), rangzhin (*rang bzhin*) and thukje (*thugs rje*), seem to be inherently separate from each other (in fact, the entities that constitute the thukje aspect seem to be substantial rather than void, and therefore seem to have an essence different from the ngowo aspect, which is voidness and which is completely ignored). To conclude, it seems important to emphasize the above-mentioned fact that the first type of *avidya* or *ma rig pa* always underlies the second type.

The third type of *avidya* or *ma rig pa* in the threefold classification chosen here, which in the case of normal individuals always accompanies the second, consists in ignoring (*mi shes pa*) the fact that the dualistic appearances that arise by virtue of the second type, are false and baseless. This type of *avidya* or *ma rig pa* is the condition for the second type to go on uninterruptedly, for without it the contradiction constituted by the second type would turn into conflict and thus there would be a possibility of surpassing it: this is why it is said that in order to escape from jail first we have to realize that we are in jail, and why Shantideva said that with regard to the hair representing the suffering of *samsara*, superior bodhisattvas have ceased to be like the palm of the hand and become like the globe of the eye, from which the hair has to be extracted without delay. In the gradual Mahayana, the Path is divided into five paths (which are stages on one of the Paths and vehicles discussed in this chapter, rather than being Paths in the sense of being distinct ways of proceeding toward Awakening); bodhisattvas on the third and fourth Mahayana paths in their post-Contemplation state (Skt. *prishthalabdha*; Tib. jethob [*rjes thob*]) have *avidya* or *ma rig pa* in both the first and second of the senses of the terms in the threefold classification chosen here, and hence are unaware of the true condition of the Base and experience the illusion of duality, of self-existence and so on; however, they do not fully have *avidya* or *ma rig pa* in the third of the senses the term has in the threefold classification chosen here, and hence are not totally deluded: they are not fully under the illusion that the illusions they experience are not illusions.)

On the basis of the above explanation, it is easy to see that when the Madhyamikas speak of *avidya* or *ma rig pa*, they are referring to the combination of the three above meanings, and therefore that only when the three meanings manifest simultaneously can we translate the terms *avidya* or *ma rig pa* by the term "delusion."

[33] The term "phenomenon" is derived from the Greek *phainomenon*, meaning, "that which appears." Some translators use the term only with regard to objects, for they are conditioned by common sense, Judeo-

Christian religions or Western metaphysics (which may include Husserl's allegedly phenomenological philosophy), according to which what appears are the objects, which appear to the subject—which in its turn is deemed not to be an appearance. However, according to the higher forms of Buddhism and to the phenomenological, existential philosophy of Jean-Paul Sartre, among other systems, the mental subject and the dualistic consciousness associated with it are appearances that have their existence only insofar and so long as they appear (according to Mahamadhyamaka, Dzogchen and Sartre's philosophy, they arise in a basic nondual awareness; according to the Madhyamaka Prasangika they appear "implicitly and indirectly").

(The terminology used in Thögel [*thod rgal*] seems to imply that "phenomena" are all that appears as object and in particular all that seems to lie in an external dimension of jing [*dbyings*], for the illusory subject and the Gnitiveness associated to the organism are said to the manifestations of the semnyi [*sems nyid*]—nature of mind, or, simply, Gnitiveness—whereas the visions that occur are said to be manifestations of the chönyi [*chos nyid*]—the "nature of *phenomena*.")

[34] This term is not used by the Gelugpas, who do not accept forms of Madhyamaka other than what I referred to as Uma Rangtongpa (*bdu ma rang stong pa*). The term appears in some ancient Indian Madhyamika texts; in Tibet it was widely used by the Jonangpas (*jo nang pa*) and nowadays is used mainly by the Nyingmapas (*rnying ma pa*) and the Kagyüpas (*bka' brgyud pa*).

[35] Since all entities *as we experience them* are made up by our mental functions and in themselves have neither value nor worthlessness (and also the thoughts in terms of which we experience these entities have neither value nor worthlessness), delusion may be said to consist in "assigning a fictitious value to phenomena." This activity leads us to take the relative as absolute, the dependent as independent, the spurious as true, the put as given, the conditioned as unconditioned, the contingent as inherent, and so on.

[36] This directional structuring of experience has as its center the place where the mental subject seems to lie and as its direction any of the possible ones in space.

With regard to the threefold apparitional structure, it seems important to note that perception or action involving the delusory valuation of the threefold thought structure is called perceptual or cognitive obscuration (*'khor gsum rnam par rtog pa gang de shes bya sgrib par 'dod*). It must also be noted that when the emptiness of the threefold apparitional structure produced by the delusory valuation of the threefold thought structure is asserted, it is referred to as *'khor gsum dag pa*: purity or emptiness (*dag pa*) of the threefold apparitional structure (*'khor gsum*). In its turn, the surpassing of the threefold apparitional structure in different ambits is referred to by terms such as: *'khor gsum rnam par mi rtog pa'i ye she* or "primordial gnosis that does not conceive the threefold thought structure;" *'khor gsum rnam par mi rtog pa'i shes rab* or "the discriminating wisdom that does not conceive of the threefold thought structure;" *'khor gsum rnam par mi rtog pa'i lta ba* or the Vision that does not conceive of the threefold thought structure;" *'khor gsum mi dmigs pa'i shes rab* or "discriminating wisdom not having the threefold thought structure as its frame of reference;" *'khor gsum rnam par mi rtog pa'i las dang 'bras bu* or "action and fruit [of action] devoid of the threefold thought structure;" *'khor gsum yongs dag gi sgrub pa' spyod pa* or "accomplishing practice totally free of threefold thought structure;" *'khor gsum yongs su da pa'i gtam* or "talk totally free from the threefold thought structure;" *'khor gsum mi dmigs pa de kho na nyid kyi lta ba* or "the view of thatness devoid of the threefold thought structure;" *'khor gsum yang dag gi bsngo ba* or "dedication wholly devoid of the threefold thought structure;" etc.

The term *bya byed las gsum*, which literally means "action, doer and object" and therefore refers to the three aspects of the apparitional structure discussed above, is a grammatical rather than a Buddhist concept; however, sometimes this term is also used in terms referring to the absence of the threefold apparitional structure (for example, when the term *bya byed las gsum la rnam par rmi rtog pa* is used for referring to the absence of the conception of the three spheres *qua* action, doer and object).

Most special thanks are due to the accomplished translator and scholar Elio Guarisco for the extensive research he so kindly did on my behalf concerning the usage of this term.

[37] I had begun preparing a paper for the South-American Conference on Philosophy that took place in October 2002 in Caracas, Venezuela, but then I decided that, rather than attending the Conference, I would finish preparing an enlarged, enriched, revised and corrected English translation of *Budismo y dzogchén* (the First Part of which is Capriles (2003) (the definitive, corrected version of which will soon be available in print), my book on the four philosophical schools of Buddhism taught in Tibet (Capriles [2004], the definitive, corrected version of which will also soon be available in print), and the three volumes of the present book. Therefore, I stopped writing the paper, which I was just beginning, but

conserved this quotation, which seemed to fit here. Below I adapted some relevant paragraphs of the article in question (which examine in greater detail the subject briefly dealt with in note 28):

(1) Realists and materialists posit the existence of a physical universe, which common sense regards as external to and independent of human perception. Among such people, those who believe that the sciences discover the precise structure and function of reality generally take consensually accepted theories in the field of physics to be a faithful description of the reality they interpret (however, as will be shown in Part III of this book, though sciences are widely held to discover truths, they do no more than producing uncertain theories). Albert Einstein's Field Theory pictured the universe as a single energy field: since it pictured it as a continuum, as such lacking interruptions or empty spaces, it may aptly be characterized as "absolute plenitude." More recent theories, such as Superunification hypotheses, David Bohm's Holonomic Theory, etc. lend even more weight to this vision of the universe as a continuum without inherent or substantial divisions, which insofar as it is devoid of interruptions or empty spaces is free of multiplicity. All of these theories, if correct, would imply that our perception of the cosmos as a multiplicity of substances is an error or delusion.

In the case of those who take the discoveries of the sciences to be true, the above conception may serve as an antidote to the belief that material entities are self-existent and substantial; now we must provide them with an antidote to the belief that mental phenomena are manifestations of a substance different from the universal energy field. Toward the beginning of the twentieth century CE, on the basis of early twentieth century physics, philosophers such as Alfred North Whitehead and the Austrian Empirio-Criticists (which included Richard Avenarius, Ernst Mach—who never met Avenarius—and Avenarius' disciple Joseph Petzoldt), seemingly on the basis of the fact that mental phenomena (including consciousness, the mental subject, dreams, perceptions and so on) necessarily have to be made of something, and that it would be absurd to think that they are made of something other than the energy field that makes up the physical universe, described the universe as made of a single stuff—which according to Avenarius could not be said to be either "mental" or "physical," for these two are mutually exclusive—nor could it be considered to be a third substance different from matter and mind (Carstanjen, cited in Lenin [1977]). In order to dismiss these views, which threatened the subsistence of the categories of materialism and idealism, V. I. Lenin (1977) had to speciously define "matter" as a "philosophical category" and establish that by definition "mental" phenomena are excluded from this category. At any rate, the dualistic assertion of the supposed existence of two wholly different substances, one mental and the other one physical, and not made of the same energy, would resurrect the insurmountable philosophical problem René Descartes faced when he tried to explain how the *res cogitans* (his name for the "soul," which in his view was neither spatial nor material) communicated with the organism, which was part of the *res extensa* (the extended "physical" universe). Therefore, the realist and the materialist would be wiser if they asserted thoughts, dreams, perceptions and psychic experiences in general, as well as consciousness, to be part of the universal energy field, and hence acknowledged that it is a delusion for the mental subject to feel different and separate from the physical world.

(2) Extreme idealists claim that there is no physical world external to and independent from human experience, and therefore that all entities are made of the stuff of which mental experiences are made. Those who adopt this theory have to acknowledge that there is no reason for believing that the stuff in question has interruptions or empty spaces, and thus implicitly they would be positing a continuum just like Einstein's, but that would be psychic rather that physical (in fact, extreme idealists necessarily would have to conclude that Einstein produced his theory on the basis of the study of his own experience, and therefore that it is the latter that, if Einstein's methods and conclusions were sound, must be asserted to constitute a continuum). If a view like this one were correct, then the entities that we categorize as "material" would be part of a continuum and would not at all be substantial or self-existent, and all mental phenomena also would be part of the continuum of which all of the entities that normally we regard as "physical" are part. Therefore, it would be a delusion to perceive physical entities as being self-existent, and it would be equally delusory for the mental subject to experience itself as different and separate from the so-called physical world. (If theories of this kind were correct, then the unity of the universe revealed by twentieth century physics and universally accepted henceforth would be in fact the unity of the psychic stuff of which all entities would be made: while believing they are probing a physical universe, physicists would in truth be probing their own psyche.)

Actually, it would hardly be possible to distinguish this view from that indicated as (1), for both (1) and (2) claim that what we regard as physical and what we regard as mental are made of the same stuff, and

therefore this stuff would have neither *genus proximum* nor *differentia specifica*—and hence it would be absurd to call it either "physical" or "mental" (which, as noted above, is precisely the conclusion Avenarius reached on the basis of position [1] and of early twentieth century physics). (As will be shown in a subsequent note, *definitio fit per genus proximum et differentiam specificam*: definition is carried out by naming the immediately wider genus [*genus proximum*] in which the class being defined is included, and the specific difference [*differentia specifica*] of the class in question, which is the characteristic that sets it apart from other classes within the same genus. In the definition of the human being as a "rational animal," "animal" is the *genus proximum*, while "rational" is the *differentia specifica*—and thus the concept of "human" is relative to both that of "animal" and that of "irrational." This shows quite clearly that all contents of thoughts are *relative* to their *genus proximum* and their *differentia specifica*—and, insofar as these are relative to other contents of thoughts that are relative to other contents of thoughts [and so on *ad infinitum*], they are relative to *all other contents of thought* as well. Furthermore, all phenomena belong to relative truth because they may be singled out and individualized only insofar as they correspond to a concept, in terms of which they are perceived.)

(3) Skepticism, critical phenomenalism and phenomenology accept that, since all we can know lies within our own experience, beyond which we have no way to look, we must keep one or another type of *epoche* or suspension of judgment with regard to the supposed existence of an objective world external to and independent from experience. Since most people consider our experience to be made of a single "mental" stuff, and since there are no grounds for believing this "mental stuff" not to be a continuum, they should agree that, if we base ourselves solely *on of what we can effectively know*, we must conclude that it is a delusion to perceive what we call "physical entities" (but which, insofar as we can only know our own experience, are part of this experience) as being self-existent, and that it is equally delusory for the mental subject to feel different and separate from the entities that appear to it as object.

(4) The Dzogchen teachings assert that all phenomena are manifestations of a continuum of basic energy (the third of the three aspects of the Base that will be considered below in the regular text of this chapter), which in *samsara* manifests as two *apparently* separate dimensions, but in *nirvana* manifests as a single, continuous, indivisible dimension. In fact, in *samsara*, as a result of the manifestation of a form of energy called tsel (*rtsal*), the phenomena of this form of energy, which include all of what we experience as constituting a self-existing "physical" world, appear to lie in an external dimension or jing (*dbyings*), whereas those of the form of energy called dang (*gdangs*), which include all thoughts and all that we regard as "mental phenomena," and which in themselves are neither "internal" nor "external," seem to lie in an internal dimension or "internal jing." Contrariwise, in *nirvana* the appearance of the existence of two different dimensions, one internal and the other external, simply does not arise. Therefore, in terms of this conception it would be utterly absurd to ask whether one of the three options discussed above is correct and the others are wrong: since both what we experience as internal and what we experience as external are forms of manifestation of a single energy continuum, it would be absurd to claim that there is a physical universe of which thought is part, or a mental universe of which the apparently physical universe is a manifestation—and it would be equally absurd to posit an inherently existing external world that we may be either capable or incapable of knowing.

Even though this Dzogchen way of explaining cannot be demonstrated to be true by logical proof, it is corroborated by the realization of *nirvana*. In fact, in *nirvana* we realize that there was always a single continuum of energy, which in *samsara* manifested as though there were two different dimensions, one internal and the other one external.

Madhyamaka philosophy did a good job in refuting the supposed inherently separate existence of entities, and the Mahayana in general has striven to show that there is no multiplicity of substances, but a single universal continuum, on the basis of which delusive mental activity produces the illusion of substantial multiplicity (see Capriles [2004]—the definitive, corrected version of which will soon be available in print). As soon as the continuum of plenitude that is the single nature of all entities appears to have been sundered and thereby we come to feel separate from our objects, we are under the error or delusion that Buddhists call *avidya* or *ma rig pa* (i.e. *avidya* or *ma rig pa* in the second of the senses these terms have in the threefold classification chosen here). It is this illusory sundering that gives rise to the lack of completeness and plenitude we have been considering, and to the uncontrollable longing to fill it. Therefore, there can be no doubt that (as acknowledged in the teaching of the *pratitya samutpada* featuring the twelve links or *nidana* of interdependent origination) *avidya* is the cause of the craving, avidity or thirst called *trishna*. Since, as we have seen, according to Shakyamuni's initial discourse of the

First Promulgation, *trishna* was *the cause* of *duhkha*, *avidya* is *the cause of the cause* of *duhkha* and thus must be regarded as being the true second Noble Truth.

[38] This Sutra contains the first teaching of Shakyamuni Buddha, expressing the Four Noble Truths.

[39] As we have seen, "delusion or error" is the combination of the three senses the threefold classification chosen here give the terms *avidya* and *ma rig pa*, which were described in a previous note.

[40] The eight elements of the "Eightfold Noble Path" (Skt. *ashtangika marga* or *aryashtanga marga*; Pali, *atthangika magga* or *ariya atthanga magga*; Tib. *'phags pa'i lam yan lag brgyad*) may be briefly explained as follows:

(1) Right view (Skt. *samyagdrishti*; Tib. yangdakpai tawa [*yang dag pa'i lta ba*]) consists in adherence to key Buddhist concepts such as the Four Noble Truths, dependent origination, cause-and-effect and so on, and in the uprooting of all wrong views.

(2) Right thought (Skt. *samyaksamkalpa*; Tib. yangdakpai tokpa [*yang dag pa'i rtog pa*]) consists in the cultivation of a mental attitude centered on following the Buddhist Path to its final destination.

(3) Right speech (Skt. *samyagvak*; Tib. yangdakpai ngag [*yang dag pa'i ngag*]) consists in avoidance of harsh words, lying, slander and gossip, and the cultivation of their opposites.

(4) Right disciplined behavior (Skt. *samyakkarmanta*; Tib. yangdakpai lekyi tah [*yang dag pa'i las kyi mtha'*]) consists in acting in accordance with whatever precepts one has taken on.

(5) Right livelihood (Skt. *samyagajiva*; Tib. yangdakpai tsowa [*yang dag pa'i 'tsho ba*]) consists in the avoidance of occupations harmful to beings.

(6) Right effort (Skt. *samyagvyayama*; Tib. yangdakpai tsölwa [*yang dag pa'i rtsol ba*]) consists in doing good and avoiding evil, adopting a mind-set aimed at liberation from *samsara*, and implementing the practices prescribed toward this aim.

(7) Right presence, recollectedness or mindfulness (Skt. *samyaksmriti*; Tib. yangdakpai tenpa [*yang dag pa'i dran pa*]) consists in maintaining constant awareness and presence of mind and regulating one's behavior by it.

(8) Right meditative absorption (Skt. *samyaksamadhi*; Tib. yangdakpai tingngedzin [*yang dag pa'i ting nge 'dzin*]) consists in the capacity to fix the mind on an object resulting from the previous aspects, which should allow one to develop the four absorptions of the *rupa loka* or *rupadhatu* and, finally, attain liberation.

[41] It is said that some forms of Buddhism are *higher* than others when their application allows *individuals of greater capacity* to obtain *a most radical and complete realization in a shorter time*. Therefore, they are "higher" in a relative sense: they are higher *for the individual with the necessary capacity to practice them*, and *only insofar as their practice works for that individual*. For individuals of lesser capacity, "lesser" vehicles can be superior to "higher" ones, insofar as they can be more effective. Likewise, at those times when the practice of "higher" vehicles does not work for individuals of higher capacities, the practice of "lower" vehicles may be more effective for them, and thus these may be temporarily "higher" for them than vehicles universally deemed "higher".

[42] Including present-day Bönpos, these are the five principal Tibetan Buddhist Schools existing in our time. However, if we speak of Schools of Buddhism in general (and not only of Tibetan Buddhism), the Schools may be:

II. The Buddhist schools of India:

(1) The eighteen schools of the Hinayana, which are extinct in our time, and which were: the *Kashyapiya*, the *Mahishasaka*, the *Dharmaguptaka*, the *Bahushrutiya*, the *Tamrashatiya*, the *Vibhajyavada*, the *Mulasarvastivadin*, the *Kaurukullika*, the *Avantaka*, the *Vatsiputriya*, the *Purvashaila*, the *Uttarashaila*, the *Haimavata*, the *Lokottaravada*, the *Prajñaptivada*, the *Mahaviharavadin*, the *Jetavaniya* and the *Abhayagirivasin*. (There were other schools of the Hinayana that developed from these eighteen; among these, the Mahasanghikas, for example, were considered heretical by the rest.)

(2) The later Hinayana schools, not included among the eighteen schools: Among these ranks the only Hinayana school that continues to exist independently, which is the Theravada and which developed within the *Mahasthavira* or *Aryasthavira* School. Tibetans conserved as objects of study only two Hinayana systems, which are not among the eighteen original schools either: (1) the Vaibhashika (a Mulasarvastivadin-dominated synthesis of various Sarvastivadin or "realistic" schools), and (2) the Sautrantika.

(3) The two schools of the Mahayana, which are the Yogachara and the Madhyamaka.

III. The Buddhist schools of China, Japan, etc. among which are found those schools that the Chinese consider to be fully Mahayana (such as *Ch'an* [Japanese, *Zen*], *Hua-yen* [Japanese, *Kegon*], *T'ien-tai* [Japanese, *Tendai*], *Ching-t'u-tsung* or Pure Land [Japanese, *Jodo-shu*], *Nirvana*, *Tripitaka*, *Vinaya*, etc.), and those which they regard as quasi-Mahayana, which are the one that gives continuity to the Madhyamaka (the *San-lun-tsun* or "Three Treatises" School, which in Japan was called *Sanron*) and the one that gives continuity to the Yogachara (the *Fa-hsiang* School, whose prestige diminished after the T'ang dynasty, and which in Japan was called *Hosso*).

[43] The Masters I mentioned in this paragraph of the regular text were all from Oddiyana (identified as the valley of Kabul in what nowadays is Afghanistan and/or as the Swat valley in what nowadays is North-West Pakistan) and India. However, in the "First Diffusion of Buddhism" one of the leading roles was played by a series of Ch'an Masters from China; I did not mention them as one of the sources of the teachings practiced by the Nyingmapa insofar as the practice of Ch'an has not been taught in the context of the complete Nyingma system of vehicles since the twelfth century CE, when Nubchen Sangye Yeshe wrote the *Samten Migdrön* (*bsam gtan mig sgron*)—the only exception being the *Kathang Dennga* (*bka' thang sde lnga*) by Namkhai Nyingpo (*nam mkha'i snying po*), which, despite having been written before the *Kathang Dennga*, was hid as a terma (*gter ma*) and then revealed in the sixteenth century CE by tertön (*gter ston*) Örgyen Lingpa (*o rgyan ling pa*) of Yarge (*yar rje*).

Ch'an Buddhism traces its origins to Shakyamuni's "Silent Sermon," in which according to Ch'an tradition Mahakashyapa received Shakyamuni's "Transmission of Mind," but I would not discard the possibility that it be the result of the adaptation of teachings of the Semde series of Dzogchen to basic principles of the Path of Renunciation (and in particular of the Mahayana), by Dzogchen Masters which may have included Nagarjuna and his disciple Aryadeva—who, as we are told in the *Chöjung Khepai Gatön* (*chos 'byung mkhas pa'i dga' ston*) by Pawo Tsuglag Threngwa (*dpa' bo gtsug lag phreng ba*), were links in the transmission of Dzogchen (Namkhai Norbu [1988]), and who, as the *Sutra of Hui-neng* tells us (Wong-Mou-Lam [trans. 1969]), were links in the transmission of Ch'an. Given the common ground shared by Dzogchen and Ch'an, it is also possible that some of the Ch'an teachings imported into Tibet by the Chinese Ch'an Masters of the eighth century CE may have been reintegrated into the authentic practice of Dzogchen Ati in quite a natural manner (which according to some accounts actually happened in the case of Aro Yeshe Jungne and the Khampa Semde tradition).

[44] Some of the schools that from the beginning declared themselves to be Buddhist, such as the Jonangpa (*jo nang pa*) and so on, are practically extinct.

[45] The terma (*gter ma*) tradition is the second pathway for the transmission of the state of rigpa, together with teachings, texts, practices, sadhanas and so on pertaining to the Paths of transformation and spontaneous liberation, as well as ritual objects, images, medicinal substances and a series of other precious objects—and even of worldly realizations and practices (though here I have circumscribed the terma transmission to the Paths of transformation and spontaneous liberation, some teachings of the Sutrayana were also transmitted as termas: for example, it is said that Shakyamuni left the sutras of the *Prajñaparamita* in the custody of the nagas for Nagarjuna to take them out as termas when the times were ripe). Lineages of this tradition are said to be "short" because they involve a much lesser number of human links than the kama (*bka' ma*) tradition (the latter being the one that has passed through human links since the time of the original revelation until our days): in the terma pathway, transmission passes directly from Padmasambhava (eighth century CE) to a Revealer or tertön (*gter ston*)—who could well be our contemporary—who in his or her turn transmits to his or her disciples and, most importantly, to his or her successor(s), whatever teachings and so on he or she reveals. It is for this reason that the teaching may be more effective: having passed through a lesser number of hands, it is less likely that the transmission may have been damaged due to the breaking of *samaya* by one or more of its links (and, if the tertön is our own teacher, the only way the transmission may have been damaged is if we ourselves broke the *samaya*). In particular, this type of transmission has made it possible, when time and circumstances are propitious, for the revelation of teachings or objects that either were not suitable for previous times, or that, had they been revealed in those times, in the best of cases would have been lost.

Though Tibetologists in general are aware that the *Kathang Dennga* (*bka' thang sde lnga*) is a terma (*gter ma*) revealed by Örgyen Lingpa (*o rgyan gling pa*), it is not generally known that the original author of the text revealed was Namkhai Nyingpo (*nam mkha'i snying po*).

[46] The teachings of the first dissemination of Buddhism in Tibet came mainly from the land of Oddiyana, identified in a previous note. The teachings of that period that did not come from that country are the

Madhyamika teachings of Shantarakshita, which came from India, and the teachings of the *Anuyoga*, which came from the land of Drusha (*bru sha*), which Chögyal Namkhai Norbu identified as the ex-Soviet republic of Kyrgyzstan (according to Giuseppe Tucci, who was refuted by Chögyal Namkhai Norbu, Drusha was Gilgit and neighboring areas; cf. Tucci [1980], p. 214).

[47] Some Dzogchen texts subsume *Shravakayana* and *Pratyekabuddhayana* under Hinayana as the second vehicle, and add as the first vehicle one comprised by the so-called "mundane paths;" however, it must be clear that in this case the first vehicle does not belong to a supramundane Path and hence may not be classified either within the Path of renunciation or within any of the other Paths being discussed.

[48] Present scholarship agrees that the debate of Samye never took place, and considers that its occurrence was a concoction due to political reasons (which had to do with whether the influence of Chinese or Indian Buddhism—and hence of China or India—was to prevail in Tibet). (At the time of Sosem Gampo, the Tibetans conquered a great deal of China and arrived at the doors of Ch'ang-an [Sian]**,** the T'ang capital of China, and to the south they conquered the lands extending as far as the Ganges in the present day Indian state of Uttar Pradesh. Then both the Emperor of China and the King of Nepal sent daughters as spouses to Sosem Gampo in order to establish an alliance so as to prevent further Tibetan invasions, and to try to convert Tibetans to Buddhism, in the hope that adoption of the doctrine of *ahimsa* or nonviolence would cause the war-like inhabitants of the roof of the world to stop invading their neighbors.)

[49] All schools of Tibetan Buddhism accept the division into gradual and sudden Mahayana. However, the official position of the Gelugpa and the Sakyapa, and the personal position of quite a few lamas from the Sarmapa or "new" Schools, is that the sudden Mahayana is a heterodox, nihilistic deviation. The basis for this position is that, according to Butön's *History of the Dharma* (Obermiller [1999])—a text written a considerable time after the debate of Samye between abrupt and gradual Mahayana is supposed to have taken place, and conditioned by the facts discussed in the preceding note—in the Samye debate Chinese Master Hwashan Mahayana, the representative of the sudden Mahayana, was defeated by the Indian Master of gradual Mahayana, Kamalashila.

Among the Nyingmapa or "ancient ones" there is no unanimous opinion regarding the sudden Mahayana; in Capriles (2003, 2004)—the definitive versions of which will soon be available in print—I noted that the *Lopön Thangyig* (*blo pon thang yig*), a Nyingmapa text that was written shortly after the moment when the debate is supposed to have taken place and then was hidden as (*gter ma*) or spiritual treasure, gives as the winner the Chinese Master of abrupt or sudden Mahayana, Hwa-shan Mahayana. In the same texts, I indicated the sources in which the two most renowned Dzogchen Masters of the last several centuries—Longchenpa and Jigme Lingpa—make it clear that they share the view of the *Lopön Thangyig*.

Furthermore, as noted in the regular text, Nyingma works such as the *Kathang Dennga* (*bka' thang sde lnga*) by Namkhai Nyingpo and the *Samten Migdrön* (*bsam gtan mig sgron*) by Nubchen Sangye Yeshe, officially divide the Mahayana into gradual and sudden, and declare the sudden Mahayana to be superior to the gradual Mahayana. Following Chögyal Namkhai Norbu, I base myself on these texts for listing the sudden Mahayana as one of the two main classes of the Mahayana, and rating it as being superior to the gradual Mahayana.

(Though I have been referring to Ch'an or Zen as "sudden Mahayana," it must be noted that, according to the *Sutra of Hui-neng* or *Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch* [Wong-Mou-Lam, 1969], there are no sudden vehicles, but "individuals who are quicker than others.")

[50] The non-yogic vehicles that constitute the Path of purification of the outer Tantras, and the yogic vehicles constitute the Path of transformation properly speaking, corresponding to the inner Tantras. Strictly speaking, the *Yogatantrayana,* which is classified among the outer Tantras, as its very name makes it clear, is a *yogic* Path, and, as such, applies to some degree the principle of the Path of transformation. Yet, insofar as it also applies the principle of purification of the outer Tantras, to the extent of being classified as an outer *Tantra,* it cannot be regarded as belonging to the Path of transformation properly speaking. Thus the correct view in this regard seems to be that the *Yogatantrayana* combines the principle of purification proper to the outer Tantras with the principle of transformation of the inner Tantras of the Path of transformation, and as such lies between the Path of purification and the Path of transformation.

[51] In many texts, we find the name *Upatantra* instead of *Ubhayatantra*, which is the correct name. In fact, this name makes the point that this Vehicle is midway between the *Kriyatantrayana* and the *Yogatantrayana*, sharing some of the characteristics of each.

52 Since we do not see other human beings as defiled and evil, we do not react to their actions with evil passions, and since we see everything as immaterial and made of sheer light, we can realize it to be primordially pure (katak [*ka dag*]). Though the description of this sub-Path provided in the regular text and further elaborated in this note may lead one to believe that it is inferior to the Mahayana, this is not the case, for its view of the Buddha-nature is "higher" than those found in the Mahayana, and the manifestation of this nature as the deity and the corresponding *mandala* is used as the Path. For a more elaborate explanation of why the outer or lower Tantras are superior to the Sutrayana, cf. Capriles (2003) (the definitive, corrected version of which will soon be available in print).

53 I use this simile because it is used in Western literature; however, in truth homeopathy does not use the substances that produce syndromes, but water in which those substances were diluted but in which they are no longer present.

54 In particular, the Inner Tantras of the Path of transformation compare the practices of the Path of Method or thablam (*thabs lam*), based on the principle of transformation, to the use in the alchemical process of a type of mercury called *makshika*, and warn that its application would be extremely risky to those lacking the necessary conditions (cf. Dudjom Rinpoche [1991], Vol. I. p. 277; explanation of the term *makshika* in note 267, Vol. II, p. 19).

55 As noted elsewhere in this book and in others of my works, the term "Dzogchen" (*rdzogs chen*) may indicate either: (1) the Base, the Path and the Fruit of the Path / vehicle of spontaneous liberation (the Base, Path and Fruit being the three aspects necessary for there being a Path or vehicle), thus being a synonym of the term Atiyogatantrayana; or (2) the Fruit of the inner Tantric Vehicles of the Path of transformation in the Ancient or Nyingma system. The term "Dzogchen" has a series of synonyms, including Thigle Chenpo (*thig le chen po*) or Total Sphere, Thigle Chik (*thig le gcig*) or Single Sphere, Changchubsem (*byang chub sems*; Skt. *bodhichitta*), etc.

56 Dzogchen Atiyoga comprises three series of teachings, which are: (1) the Semde (*sems sde*) or series of the (nature of) mind (i.e. series of primordial awareness); (2) the Longde (*klong sde*) or series of space; and (3) the Menngagde (*man ngag sde*; Sanskrit *Upadeshavarga*) or series of secret oral instructions.

The Testament of the tönpa (*ston pa*) or Primordial Revealer Garab Dorje (first Master of Buddhist Dzogchen) consisted of three phrases: (1) Direct Introduction (to the state of Awakening or *nirvana* that the Dzogchen teachings call Rigpa); (2) Not to remain in doubt (with regard to the fact that the condition that revealed itself in Direct Introduction is the true condition of the universe and the real nature of all phenomena); and (3) To continue in the State (of Awakening or *nirvana* that the Dzogchen teachings call Rigpa). Garab Dorje's main disciple, Mañjushrimitra, gave rise to the three series of Dzogchen teachings when he classified the bulk of Dzogchen teachings in terms of the three phrases of Garab Dorje's testament: (1) the Semde series, which may be said to be the least direct or sudden, relates mainly to the first of the three phrases; (2) the Longde series, which is more direct, relates especially to the second of the said phrases; and (3) the Menngagde series, which is the most direct, relates principally to the third phrase. However, the relationship between the three series and the three phrases is based on emphasis, as each of the three series has methods and instructions for implementing all three phrases. (Regarding *Introduction* to Dzogchen, the Semde is more related to Oral Introduction, the Longde is more related to Symbolic Introduction, and the Menngagde is more related to Direct Introduction. For an explanation of these three types of introduction, see: Namkhai Norbu (1999, unpublished ms.); and Capriles (2000a, 2003).

57 The Dzogchen teachings characterize the state of rigpa, corresponding to the self-reGnition (of) Awake awareness that makes its own face patent, as chikshe kundröl or "all-liberating single gnosis," for the very moment this reGnition manifests, and so long as it is manifest, delusorily valued thoughts spontaneously liberate themselves and dissolve as their true condition—which is the true condition of ourselves and of the whole universe—becomes perfectly patent. The reason for this is that this self-reGnition puts an end to *avidya* or marigpa in the three senses these terms have in the threefold classification chosen here, and when the nondual Awake awareness that is the common Base of both *samsara* and *nirvana* is not veiled either by stupefaction or by the subsequent delusion involving the subject-object duality, its functionality is like that of a mirror, in which there is no distance between the reflective capacity and the reflections it manifests, and in which there is no one to adhere to the reflections; therefore the very moment this Awake awareness is self-reGnized (or, more precisely, the moment the self-reGnition of this Awake awareness is not beclouded by either the element of stupefaction or the subject-object duality), its all-liberating nature is actualized and whatever thought is

present spontaneously liberates itself that very moment—and so long as the self-reGnition of this Awake awareness continues to (be) patent, whichever thoughts may arise spontaneously liberate themselves as they arise, leaving no traces or conditionings in that Awareness, just as reflections leave no traces whatsoever in a looking glass. Conversely, when the contingent, beclouding element of stupefaction that obscures rigpa's inherent nondual self-awareness manifests, it prevents it from making patent its own face and hence from putting into action its all-liberating nature, and when the basic delusion involving the subject-object duality manifests, the illusion that our cognitive capacity is the illusory mental subject that appears to be at a distance from the appearances that manifest as object results in automatic clinging to the latter through acceptance or rejection, attachment or aversion—which besides preventing their spontaneous liberation, results in the production of karmic traces that will give rise to never-ending *samsara*. When this happens, the awareness / gnosis designated by the Tibetan term she (*shes*) manifests as the eight dualistic consciousnesses, in the following order: (1) consciousness of the base-of-all or kunzhi namshe (*kun gzhi rnam shes*), (2) defiled consciousness, consciousness of passions or nyongmongpachen yikyi namshe (*nyong mongs pa can yid kyi rnam shes*), (3) consciousness of thoughts and mental contents, and (4) the consciousnesses of the five senses widely acknowledged by Western Philosophy, Psychology and common sense. Therefore, it is utterly wrong to understand the example of the mirror to mean that in *samsara* our awareness is like a mirror in which reflections leave no traces: though in *samsara* all thoughts and perceptions dissolve after having their moment, "spontaneous liberation" means that *they are not allowed to have their moment*, for they are instantly dissolved by the manifestation of the all-liberating single gnosis. Furthermore, in *samsara* our actions based on the threefold apparitional structure and our clinging to appearances through acceptance, rejection or indifference (and their various subclasses, which make up the five, six, twenty-one and so on up to eighty-four-thousand passions), rather than leaving no traces, establish karmic traces /propensities in our mental continuum that reaffirm and sustain *samsara*.

[58] "Spontaneous liberation" means that, rather than being liberated by an intentional action carried out by the mental subject, delusorily valued thoughts and experiences conditioned by such thoughts liberate themselves *spontaneously*, *of their own accord*. Though in the first of the three types of spontaneous liberation, called cherdröl (*gcer grol*) there is an action to do, and in the second, called shardröl (*shar grol*) there is an automatic reaction, these are tricks leading the subject to trip and collapse: the moment spontaneous liberation occurs, the illusion that a separate, autonomous mental subject is perceiving or acting dissolves like a feather entering fire, for the spontaneous liberation of delusorily valued thoughts, delusory experiences and so on always involves the spontaneous liberation of the threefold apparitional structure and therefore results in the instant disappearance of the illusory mental subject. At any rate, in the third capacity of spontaneous liberation, called rangdröl (*rang grol*), neither action nor automatic reaction is involved: like drawings on water, thoughts dissolve spontaneously as they are manifesting, and thus there is no longer any "meditation," but solely authentic, true spontaneous liberation. (Insofar as this liberation involves the dissolution of the illusory mental subject, it would be extremely misleading to speak of "spontaneous liberation *from* thoughts:" this would convey the wrong idea that a self, soul or mental subject is liberated from delusory thoughts, experiences, and so forth, continuing to exist after this liberation.)

It must be noted that, even though the principle of spontaneous liberation is the distinguishing feature of the Dzogchen Atiyoga, in different Paths and Vehicles some teachings and methods seem to be based on this principle. For example, many Sutras show traces of the principle of the Path of spontaneous liberation. Likewise, the "Sudden Awakening" the Japanese call *satori* and the Chinese call *wu*, as different from the Japanese Soto conception of a *zhikan taza* that is supposed to be the very state of Buddhahood, is in general an instance of spontaneous liberation in which an extreme samsaric state is immediately followed by the manifestation of *nirvana* (and as such is effective in distinguishing *samsara* from *nirvana* [Tib. khorde rushen / *'khor 'das ru shan*).

[59] This example is typical of the Tekchö (*khregs chod*) level of the *Upadeshavarga* or Menngagde (*man ngag sde*) series of Dzogchen teachings, in which it illustrates self-liberation in this practice, but it may be applied to all instances of self-liberation in Dzogchen practice.

Total relaxation occurs not only in rigpa-*qua*-Path and rigpa-*qua*-Fruit, but also in the condition of the base-of-all in which neither *samsara* nor *nirvana* are active. However, in the practices of the Dzogchen Menngagde or *Upadeshavarga*, this total relaxation takes place instantaneously upon the reGnition (of) Awake awareness, immediately after a moment of tension; therefore, it makes perfectly clear the contrast

between *samsara* and *nirvana*, while neutralizing to some extent the propensities for *samsara* to manifest and increasing the individual's capacity of self-liberation (the degree to which samsaric propensities are neutralized and the individual's capacity of self-liberation increases being directly proportional to the intensity of the tension immediately preceding self-liberation and the energetic-volume-determining-the-scope-of-awareness at the time of self-liberation). Therefore, repetition of self-liberation in these conditions makes us become increasingly familiar with *nirvana* while at the same time allowing us to progressively establish ourselves in it.

Contrariwise, in the condition of the base-of-all *nirvana* does not manifest, the propensities for *samsara* to manifest are not neutralized, and there is no dynamic helping us become established in *nirvana*: this is why dwelling in this state is compared to cutting one's own head.

[60] This will happen when spontaneous liberation occurs. In the first type or capacity of spontaneous liberation, which as we have seen is the one called cherdröl (*gcer grol*), it will do so regardless of whether the thought one looks into is a coarse thought, a subtle / intuitive thought, or a supersubtle thought such as the "threefold thought structure."

[61] For an explanation of some of the differences and identities between the *Anuttarayogatantrayana* of the Sarmapas and the *Mahayogatantrayana* of the Nyingmapas, cf. Capriles (2003).

[62] This concept was explained in a previous endnote to this chapter.

[63] We have seen that the term *Atiyogatantrayana* refers to a vehicle (Skt. *yana*) with its three aspects, which are the Base, the Path and the Fruit. As stated in a previous note, the term Dzogchen (*rdzogs chen*) refers both to the vehicle called *Atiyogatantrayana*, and to the Fruit of the two inner Tantras of the Path of Transformation of the Nyingmapa tradition—the *Mahayogatantrayana* and the *Anuyogatantrayana*. (The prefix *ati* in the language of Oddiyana corresponds to the prefix *adi* in Sanskrit.)

[64] Here the term "absolute" is not being used in the sense it has when Buddhism speaks of "absolute truth," but in the sense of being free from degrees, measures and quantitative comparisons.

[65] As will be shown in the next section of the regular text, the inner Nyingma Tantras explain our true condition, which the Dzogchen teachings call Dzogchen, in terms of two indivisible aspects: (1) katak (*ka dag*) or "primordial purity," which corresponds to emptiness and which is called "purity" because the impurity that distorts the Base and gives rise to defilements is the illusion of substance or self-existence, and (2) lhundrub (*lhun grub*) or "spontaneous perfection," corresponding to spontaneous manifestation and its perfect functionality: the Base is empty, just as are all experiences, which lack self-existence or substance, but it is at the same time "luminous" in the sense of "experience-manifesting"—and in fact experiences never stop arising (for an explanation of the meaning of emptiness in these different contexts cf. the discussion of the various senses of the term in this chapter, or the more in-depth discussion of the same subject in Capriles [2003]).

In the translation of the term Dzogchen (*rdzogs chen*) as "total completeness / plenitude and perfection," the terms "plenitude" and "completeness" respond to the katak acceptation the term dzogpa, whereas the term "perfection" responds to the lhundrub acceptation of the same term. The former is due to the fact that the direct realization of the lack of self-existence of all entities in the state of absolute truth puts an end to the basic human illusion that consists in experiencing oneself as being at a distance from the sensory continuum; therefore, it brings to a halt the lack of plenitude and completeness that issued from this illusion—and so the realization of the katak aspect of the Base is the realization of absolute completeness and plenitude (see Capriles [to-be-published-soon 2]). The symbolic representation of katak / emptiness is perfectly consistent with this fact: it is the color white, which is the sum of all colors, rather than in the color black, which is the lack of color.

[66] As shown in a previous note, we cannot claim all of it is material, firstly because "material" is defined in contrast (*differentia specifica*) with "immaterial" or "mental," so that if there were nothing immaterial or mental the concept of "material" would lose its meaning, and secondly because all we can know is our own experience, and there is no way to prove that this experience reflects a nonexperiential, nonmental reality external to it that may be said to be material in contrast with "mental" (and if we understood by "material" our experience of what we call "material," it will not be permissible to claim that all is material).

Likewise, even if we could take a look outside our experience in order to determine whether or not there is a reality external to it and as a result we verified that there is no such reality, it would be wrong to claim all is mental, for "mental" is defined in contrast with "material" or "physical," and hence if there were nothing material or physical the concept of "mental" would lose its meaning. However, as we have seen,

all we can know is our own experience and hence we cannot look beyond it to determine whether or not there is an external reality different from it.

[67] In a previous note, this continuum was considered in terms of four possibilities, which were: (1) all is mental; (2) all is material; (3) we suspend judgment concerning whether it is mental or material; and (4) we understand it in terms of the Dzogchen explanation of the Base or zhi (*gzhi*).

[68] The Sanskrit term *karuna*, which is normally rendered into English as "compassion," is translated into Tibetan both as thukje (*thugs rje*) and as nyingje (*snying rje*): both thuk (*thugs*) and nying (*snying*) mean "heart," while je (*rje*) may be translated as "soft and noble."

Why should the disposition to manifest appearances and the process of their uninterrupted arising be referred to by a term meaning "compassion"? After Awakening, fully Awake Ones (*anuttara samyak sambuddha*) continue to be physiologically alive—rather than dying after a few days, as occurs in the case of solitary realizers or *pratyekabuddhas*—because of the spontaneous manifestation of nonreferential compassion. Therefore, it is as a function of nonreferential compassion that the thukje aspect of the Base will continue to give rise to phenomena in their continuum (even though, of course, it will no longer be experienced as the succession of a multiplicity of phenomena, for fully Awake individuals are beyond experience as such and neither interpret nor experience this aspect of the Base in terms of concepts such as plurality or oneness).

It could be objected that this may be so in the case of Buddhas, for they do not experience themselves as beings thrown into the world by an external power, but not in the case of deluded individuals, to whom appearances continue to manifest inexorably even in the absence of compassion. However, the point is that Buddhahood consists in no longer feeling different or separate from the Base. Since the Base (is) the Buddha-nature involving the three kayas and therefore including the *nirmanakaya qua* Base, and since one of the meanings of *nirmanakaya* (is) the same as that of what the Dzogchen teachings call energy or thukje aspect of the Base, whatever may be said of the Buddhas may be said of the Base. In fact, even though only Buddhas are not unaware that the energy or thukje aspect of the Base continues to manifest because of nonreferential compassion, in all individuals, including deluded ones, this aspect continues to manifest as the function of nonreferential compassion—and it is only insofar as deluded individuals experience themselves as creatures inherently separate from the rest of the Base that they fail to realize this to be so.

As noted in the upcoming revised version of Capriles (2003), some teachers insist that the energy of thukje aspect of the Base does *not* consist in the unceasing process of manifestation of phenomena and in these phenomena themselves, but in the unimpededness that permits the manifestation of phenomena, which may be noticed in the instant preceding manifestation. The point behind this is easily understood in terms of the representation of the Base in terms of the simile of a mirror, which compares phenomena to the reflections in the mirror—for in fact it is not permissible to claim that the reflections that manifest in a mirror *are* the mirror. However, neither is it permissible to claim that they are something different or separate from the mirror, for they (are) a function of the mirror, and they (are) certainly not outside the mirror or separate from it. The point is that they are *nothing at all*, for, in Longchenpa's words (Longchen Rabjam [1998], p. 84):

"In accordance with the eight traditional metaphors for illusoriness, an examination of phenomena as forms of emptiness, clearly apparent yet unthinkable, ineffable and void... determines their equalness in having no identity. One knows the basic space of unchanging emptiness through these natural manifestations of the nature of mind."

Likewise (Longchen Rabjam [2001b], p. 156) writes:

"Using one of the eight metaphors for illusoriness, they are understood to be reflections that manifest clearly without existing anywhere, outwardly or inwardly."

What the Semde teachings represent with the simile of a mirror is the nature of mind, primordial awareness, bodhichitta, thigle chenpo or however we call the primordial condition. Phenomena manifest naturally as the play (rölpa [*rol pa*]), the projective (tsel [*rtsal*]) energy and the adornment (gyen [*rgyan*]) of this nature of mind, primordial awareness or however we call it—and, as seen in the quotation, they (are) *natural manifestations of this nature of mind or however wee call it.* As Longchenpa noted, one may say that the reflections are the mirror in the sense in which one uses the name "sun" to refer to the rays of the sun when one says, "Sit in the midday sun." Furthermore, isn't it said that the world such as it presents itself to our impure vision is the *nirmanakaya*? And isn't it said that the *dharmakaya* (and in general the single nature of all reality) is utterly free from substances other than itself—which is what is referred to

in Sanskrit by the term *parashunya* and in Tibetan by the term zhentong (*gzhan stong*)? If phenomena were different and separate from the Base (or from the nature of mind, primordial awareness, or however we call it), we could not say either that the world such as it presents itself to our impure vision is the *nirmanakaya*, or that the *dharmakaya* (and in general the Base that is the single true condition of all reality) is utterly free from substances other than itself, or that the whole of reality is the single sphere (thigle chik [*thig le gcig*], the total sphere (thigle chenpo [*thig le chen po*]), or the single condition of Dzogchen *qua* Base. And the Base has only three aspects: it does not have a fourth aspect that would consist in the manifestation of phenomena and the phenomena manifested. The point is that zhengyi ngöpo tongpanyi (*gzhan gyi dngos po stong pa nyid*; Skt. *paravastushunyata*) or "absence of substances other than the single true condition of all reality" and rangzhinggyi tongpanyi (*rang bzhing gyis stong pa nyid*; Skt. *swabhava shunyata*) or "absence of the self-existence of phenomena" imply each other, for, as noted above, insofar as phenomena (are) not different or separate from the single Base they cannot be self-existent or substantial (which is why it was said that phenomena [are] nothing at all) and insofar as phenomena are not self-existent or substantial there can be no substances other than the single Base. Furthermore, if phenomena were separate or different from the thukje aspect of the Base, the Dzogchen teachings could not claim that energy manifests in the three different ways that are dang (*gdangs*), rölpa (*rol pa*) and tsel (*rtsal*), for the energy aspect of the Base would be limited to *that which precedes* the manifestation of any of these three forms of manifestation of energy (and in particular what precedes the manifestation of the dang energy as thoughts, insofar as some particular instructions ask us to recognize as the thukje aspect of the Base the unimpededness preceding *the manifestation of thought*).

Since phenomena, including thoughts, visions, and material essents, (are) unthinkable and ineffable, anything we may assert concerning them—among other things, either that they (are) [the energy of] the Base or that they (are) something different from the [energy of the] Base—is a misrepresentation. Therefore, the only way we would be correct no matter what we said with regard to them, would be by being free of what Chandrakirti called "own mind," which consists in taking as *true* whatever we think or assert without the intention to deceive others and taking the contrary of this as *false*—and which is a synonym of "affirming from one's heart," "making self-directed / interior-directed assertions" or "having theses of one's own" (cf. Capriles [2005] and also [2004], as well as the notes in Volume II of this book). Saying something without own mind and hence being correct is what in a not perfectly precise terminology is called "other-directed" or "exterior-directed" assertions (Tib. zhen ngo kelen [*gzhan ngo khas len*]). However, it is also true that, since, as we have seen, thoughts are nothing at all, there is no process of arising and dissolution of thought and other types of appearances, and so properly speaking the thukje aspect of the Base may not be defined as the uninterrupted manifestation and dissolution of phenomena. Nonetheless, if this were the reason why it is claimed that the thukje aspect of the Base is the unimpededness that precedes the manifestation of thought, there would be no need to specify that the thukje aspect of the Base, rather than being the uninterrupted manifestation of phenomena, is the unimpededness that precedes manifestation, for the aspect in question does not change in any way upon the manifestation of thought (i.e. upon the manifestation of nothing-at-all) and the dissolution of thought (i.e. the dissolution of nothing-at-all).

Taking only the above into consideration, we should conclude that the instructions advising us to recognize the thukje aspect of the Base as the unimpededness immediately preceding *the manifestation of thought* respond to pith instructions that are skillful means for recognizing the characteristic *disposition* of each of the three aspects of the Base, and as such does not involve the problem inherent in trying to explain the nature of phenomena, which as we have seen lies in the fact that properly speaking they can neither be or not be the [energy aspect of the] Base. In fact, as the fact that attaining realization implies no longer perceiving phenomena as separate from the energy aspect of the single Base makes it clear, these instructions *would by no means imply that phenomena are not the energy aspect of the Base*.

Only if we established that previously to manifestation the three aspects of the Base should be referred to as the three primordial wisdoms which are essence or ngowo, nature or rangzhin and energy or thukje, but that during manifestation they should be called *dharmakaya*, *sambhogakaya* and *nirmanakaya* (*qua* Base when *samsara* is manifest, *qua* Path when *nirvana* manifests transitorily in the Contemplation state while on the Path, and *qua* Fruit when *nirvana* is irreversibly manifest as the Fruit), in spite of the above arguments making the point that there is no difference between the Base previously to manifestation and the Base during manifestation, would it be valid to identify the thukje aspect with the unimpededness of the potentiality for manifestation as it becomes evident previously to manifestation.

In fact, as commented in paragraph before last, it is only in the context of pith instructions that are skillful means for recognizing the characteristic *disposition* of each of the three aspects of the Base, that sometimes we find explanations of the energy or thukje aspect of the Base like the ones discussed in this note, and on the basis of conventions such as those discussed in the preceding paragraph.

[69] Cf. the seven last paragraphs of the preceding note.

[70] As shown in the note before last, the three aspects of the Base consisting in essence, nature and energy are, respectively, the *dharmakaya-qua*-Base, the *sambhogakaya-qua*-Base and the *nirmanakaya-qua*-Base. In their turn, the katak aspect of the Base is the *dharmakaya-qua*-Base and the lhundrub aspect of the Base is the *rupakaya-qua*-Base. In short, in the Base, in the Path and in the Fruit we can choose to distinguish two or three aspects, according to the circumstances.

[71] What introduces limits are our delusory valued thoughts, for the Base is limitless and in itself involves no partitions; therefore, in the case of the *dharmakaya qua* Path and the *dharmakaya qua* Fruit, it is the absence of such thoughts that is represented by the absence of corners.

[72] In a mirror (whether it be a silver-coated glass or a piece of flat, polished metal), the reflective capacity is neither separate nor at a distance from the images reflected, and the illusion of there being such a distance cannot arise.

[73] I write this term as Gnitiveness rather than as cognitiveness insofar what I am referring to by this name does not always involve the co-arising of subject and object: this co-arising takes place in *samsara* and as such is mere illusion rather than something that truly manifests, whereas in *nirvana* it simply does not take place. Therefore the reason for writing it as I do are the same why I write reGnition instead of recognition, which in a previous note I explained in terms of Paul Claudel's description of *connaissance* (knowledge) as *co-naissance* (co-emergent arising or interdependent birth).

[74] As will be shown in Part II of this book, the condition called neutral base-of-all or kunzhi lungmaten (*kun gzhi lung ma bstan*), wherein neither *nirvana* nor *samsara* are active and in which Shakyamuni rested just before Awakening, occurs again and again for extremely short instants in the everyday experience of sentient beings—even though normally it is hardly possible to notice it. The reason for this is that, as will also be shown in Part II of this book in the context of the elucidation of self-deceit, this condition does not at all involve a nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional, nonreflexive awareness (of) a consciousness of an object that is interpreted in terms of a concept—which is the condition for mnemonic imprints to be established.

[75] Whenever the delusory valuation of thought manifests, the threefold thought structure is delusorily valued, and hence the threefold delusory structure of experience manifests.

[76] In fact, our natural cybernetic system involves an inborn program that, based on the needs of survival, health, and comfort, determines which sensations we should accept, which we should reject and to which we should remain indifferent. Then early conditioning acts on the program in question: if the family is overprotective and stimulates the rejection of unpleasant sensations to an above-average degree, it is likely that the individual may become overapprehensive with regard to pain and unpleasant sensations in general and reject unpleasant sensations—even many of those that otherwise would be too subtle to elicit rejection—as soon as they arise. Since rejection causes sensations to become unpleasant, rejection of a *slightly* unpleasant sensation will cause it to become *very* unpleasant, which will cause the individual to reject it even further, making it become more unpleasant and thus eliciting further rejection, in a positive feedback loop of rejection and pain. (Recent studies have shown that people who experienced intense pain at a very early age are likely to experience pain with greater intensity than those who didn't have such experiences. One wonders whether the reason for this may be that at an early age the energetic-volume-determining-the-scope-of-awareness is higher and thus the ensuing positive feedback loop of rejection and pain reaches extremes it does not reach in the adult—conditioning the individual to always overreact to pain and thus to always magnify pain.)

[77] It is probably clear to all that a very intense pleasure may be far more intense than a very light headache. I am keeping my examples within the range of the experiences available to ordinary human beings, and hence I will not refer to "total pleasure" as it manifests in the practice of the inner Tantras of the Path of Transformation and so on.

[78] Likewise, since the first time they try them some people like seasonings like vinegar, mustard and ketchup, or amusement devices and sports like roller-coasters, bungee jumps and parachuting. However, others profoundly dislike them, and if they want to come to enjoy these seasonings, devices and sports, they have to go through a special process of learning.

[79] As pointed out in note 30, Dzogchen texts often speak of recognizing thoughts as the *dharmakaya*, of recognizing the true condition, essence or nature of thoughts, and so on. Since in such cases what the texts are referring to, is *not* what normally we understand for "recognition," I use the term reGnition, which I defined in a previous note.

[80] I am using the terms *vidya* and *rig pa* in the sense they have in the Dzogchen teachings rather than in the one they have in the Sutrayana: whereas in the former they mean *nondual Awake awareness*, in the latter they mean *science*.

[81] The term "mind" (Skt. chit [*chitta*]; Tib. sem [*sems*]) is sometimes understood in a narrower sense and contrasted to the mental events (Skt. *chaitta*; Tib. semjung [*sems byung*]). Examples of mental events are: the impulse leading consciousness to single-out an entity as figure, leaving the rest of the sensory continuum as ground; the adherence to that which was singled out; the understanding of that which was singled out in terms of a concept; the feeling tone associated to that which was singled out and understood in terms of a concept, which may be positive, negative or neutral; etc. The mind, when contrasted to the mental events, is that which sometimes seems to be in control of the mental events, sometimes seems to be controlled by them, and sometimes seems to neither in control of them nor controlled by them. For an account of the whole series of mental events, see Guenther & Kawamura (1975).

[82] Tönpas *(ston pa*) or primordial revealers are to be distinguished from tertöns (*gter ston*) or revealers, in that the former arise at a time when the lineal transmission of the teachings of Awakening in general and the Dzogchen teachings in particular has died out, and thus they reintroduce a whole system of teachings where there was none, whereas the latter arise when the lineal transmission is still alive, but it has become necessary to reintroduce some specific teachings that have been lost and which are appropriate for the time at which they are introduced. After each tönpa manifests, many tertöns may arise and reintroduce specific teachings. Furthermore, whereas tönpas do not need teachings from the lineal transmission to attain full Awakening, tertöns do need them in order to obtain full Awakening.

[83] See Tarthang Tulku (1977a). The state of Total Space-Time-Awareness is the undivided condition of totality that has not been experientially disrupted either by the subject-object schism or by the figure-ground dichotomy, so that neither space, not time, nor awareness is divided or restricted, and these three do not seem to be separate and different from each other. The state of small space-time-knowledge is the one resulting from the illusory fragmentation of totality due to the arising of the subject-object duality and of a somehow impermeable focus of conscious awareness that apprehends figures, leaving the rest of the ground in some kind of "penumbra of attention." Later on we will see that it is possible to enlarge an individual's space-time-knowledge in such a way that space, time and knowledge are still restricted, and yet she or he may gain the illusion that the state of Total Space-Time-Awareness has been attained: this is what occurs in the experiences of the summit of *samsara*, which Buddhism calls the *arupyadhatu* or "formless dimension," and which it divides into the four *arupa loka* listed elsewhere in this book.

[84] In various books (cf. for example Reynolds [1996]), the second of the Three Phrases of Garab Dorje's Testament, which is *thag gcig thog tu bcad*, has been translated as "One definitively decides upon this unique state." In Namkhai Norbu (unpublished ms.) we read:

"I have seen the English translation of a commentary to the "Three Phrases" (the *Khepa Shri Gyälpo* [*mkhas pa shri rgyal po*] by Dza Petrül Rinpoche [*dza dpal sprul rin po che*]) published in Singapore, according to which in order not to remain in doubt one should "decide upon this single point" (i.e. decide that all phenomena are the single primordial condition). The Dzogchen teaching is not something that must be accepted, or something about which one must decide. That which decides is the mind (i.e. the very core of delusion), and so to claim that one should decide that all is the single primordial state, implies that deluded mind must decide that all is its own concept of the primordial state. This has nothing to do with the Dzogchen teachings."

In fact, rather than deciding this or that, one has to return again and again to the state of Direct Introduction until certainty concerning the fact that what unconceals itself in that state is the true condition of reality, comes to permeate one's everyday consciousness, and so doubts in this regard can no longer arise. When no doubts arise, there is nothing to decide upon; one simply has to apply the instructions to Continue in the State.

[85] The energetic-volume-determining-the-scope-of-awareness is what Indians call *kundalini*—which in its turn is one of the two Sanskrit words rendered by the Tibetan term *thig le* (the other one being *bindu*). Dr Herbert V. Guenther coined the term "bioenergetic input," which suggests a von Neumann-like

conception of systems in terms of input/output and a biological origin of this energy, but which I originally liked and adopted. However, at some point I replaced it by the term "bioenergetic volume," which I deemed more graphic insofar as a high energetic-volume-determining-the-scope-of-awareness may be experienced as a huge energy flow moving through the body—and then by the term "energetic-volume-determining-the-scope-of-awareness," which does not imply that this energy has a biological origin.

In the preceding note we saw that the state that Tarthang Tulku (1977a) characterized as "small space-time-knowledge"—which depends on a low energetic-volume-determining-the-scope-of-awareness (*kundalini* or *thig le*)—features the subject-object duality and the restriction of the scope of one's focus of awareness which makes it encompass only a fragment at a time of the continuum of the *given* and to have scarcely permeable limits. This state is the condition of possibility of experiencing entities as self-existent and believing this experience gives us the true condition of entities—and therefore it is the condition of possibility of the manifestation of *avidya* / *ma rig pa* in the second and third of the meanings these terms have in the threefold classification chosen here.

The energetic-volume-determining-the-scope-of-awareness, which increases or decreases interdependently with changes in brain biochemistry, may be altered by *kundalini yoga*, *yantra yoga*, the practices of tsa/lung/thigle (*rtsa/rlung/thig le*), the methods of Thögel and the Yangthik, etc. However, a mere expansion of space-time-knowledge cannot directly result in Awakening: all it can do it to produce illusory experiences of the type designated by the Tibetan term nyam (*nyams*), the Chinese *mo-ching*, and the Japanese *makyo*—or (in Sufism) the Arabic term *hal*. In prepared individuals capable of using them as images on a mirror providing an opportunity to reGnize the true condition of the mirror, such experiences may become the condition for the reGnition of the primordial Gnitiveness represented by the mirror. However, in unprepared individuals they may elicit attachment or dread; in particular, the expansion of the hitherto narrow scope of consciousness and the permeabilization of the bounds of consciousness that accompany a sharp increase of the energetic-volume-determining-the-scope-of-awareness may induce a psychotomimetic experience or unchain a fully-fledged psychosis. For example, the increase in question may unveil the insubstantiality of the individual's being and thus induce an episode of *panic* associated to psychotic derealization. It may allow into the individual's conscious awareness contents that are ego-dystonic (incompatible with her or his self-image) and thus threaten the person's ego-function and sense of identity—which in its turn could well give rise to a psychotic episode. It may cause the pain inherent in the delusory valuation of thought to be experienced in its fullness and thus activate positive feedback loops of discomfort, pain, and anxiety: the stronger the discomfort we experience, the stronger our rejection of it, and the stronger our rejection of it, the stronger the discomfort—so that there may be a runaway of discomfort as the latter increases from its own feedback.

[86] This is one of the main reasons why the imprints made in early infancy, while the energetic input is very high, have a greater conditioning power than those established at later stages of life. In addition, it is the main reason why the practices of Thögel and the Yangthik can undo the conditioning of beginningless *samsara* in what comparatively is an extremely short time. (That a higher energetic input makes both conditioning and deconditioning more rapid and efficient is also suggested by Soviet experiments carried out during the 1960s that showed dogs learned and established habits more rapidly while under the effects of LSD.)

[87] If the energetic-volume-determining-the-scope-of-awareness does not reach the necessary level, Awakening will not occur, but if it rises before one is prepared to deal with ensuing experiences psychosis may occur. Hence, the increase of energetic-volume-determining-the-scope-of-awareness should take place interdependently with a learning or preparation that may allow one to deal with it.

[88] This is relative, for one only reaches the very end of the Path if one carries to its last consequences the fourth vision of Thögel or the Yangthik that will be briefly discussed in a subsequent note to this chapter; before that, one may be said to be an Awake individual, but this does not mean one has reached the very end of the Path.

[89] This is how Nubchen Sangye Yeshe (*gnubs chen sangs rgyas ye shes*) called the Dzogchen *Atiyoga* in the *Samten Migdrön* (*bsam gtan mig sgron*). If I am right in inferring from this and from the stories of the origins of the Tantras of the Path of transformation that these Tantras and some of the texts belonging to other vehicles derive from Dzogchen *Atiyoga*, then there could be no doubt whatsoever that the original understanding of the kayas and the sequence of their progression are the ones found in Dzogchen texts,

and that the inner *Vajrayana* Tantras of the Path of transformation had to modify that understanding and invert that progression in order to satisfy people of the capacities these texts were intended to cater to.

[90] When, in the Longde (*klong sde*) and the Menngagde (*man ngag sde*) or *Upadeshavarga* series of Dzogchen, the final attainment is carried to its very limit or very near it, the yogi may attain one of the four modes of death that are characteristic of Dzogchen. These are:

(1) The rainbow body (*'ja' lus*), which results from the "mode of death of the dakinis," and is attained by those who have attained the highest realization resulting from the practice of the Vajra-bridge (*rdo rje zam pa*), pertaining to the Longde series of Dzogchen. This realization should not be confused with the so-called "rainbow body" resulting from specific Tantric practices of the Path of Transformation, which is not at all equivalent. This realization has not been attained since the beginnings of the second millennium CE—possibly due to the increase in the power of delusion and the passions in the last millennium.

(2) The body of atoms (*lus rdul phran du dengs*), which results from the "mode of death of the vidyadharas," obtained by those who have attained the highest realization resulting from the practice of Tekchö or the Nyingthik (which, as we have seen, belong to the Menngagde series of Dzogchen). This realization, which does not result in an active phenomenon capable of helping others, is compared to the breaking of a closed vase, upon which the internal space or dimension and the external space or dimension fuse. Most likely as a result of the increase of the power of delusion and the passions, this realization has not been attained in many centuries.

(3) The body of light (*'od kyi sku* or *'od phung*), which results from the mode of death called "self-consuming like a fire," obtained by those who have developed to a certain extent the fourth vision of Thögel and/or the Yangthik, and thus attain the second highest level of realization that can result from these practices. This type of body, which is often called "rainbow body" as well, was attained by several practitioners in the twentieth century CE.

(4) The total transference (*'pho ba chen po*), which does *not* involve going through the process of death and which results from the mode of ending life called "invisible like space," obtained by those who have fully developed the fourth vision of Thögel and/or the Yangthik, attaining the highest level of realization resulting from these practices. Though the corresponding type of body (the phowa chenpo ku [*'pho ba chen po'i sku*], sometimes called jalü phowa chenpo [*'ja' lus 'pho ba chen po*]) has not been attained since the great Jetsun Senge Wangchuk achieved it in the twelfth century CE, its attainment is still possible in our time.

[91] The term "essents," used by Max Niemeyer in his translation of Heidegger (1987), just like the German word *Seiende*, seems to convey the notion of "*to be in the process of being* [this or that]." It thus seems appropriate for conveying the Buddhist understanding of the transitory nature of what normally is called "entities," which are not thought of as possessing *being qua* something stable and static, but as being in a process of constant becoming. In fact, in the Buddhist teachings, the *being* of entities is referred to by the Sanskrit word *bhava*, which means both *being* and *becoming* (whereas, as we have seen, the illusion of self-being or absolute position is called *swabhava*).

Contrariwise, the term "entity" conveys to us the idea of something static, which at some point may have come into being, but which henceforth continued to be in a stable way what it became, and therefore conveys the delusive notions of subsistence and substance.

[92] In Greek, *phainomenon* means, "that which appears." In everyday language and in various philosophical systems, the term "phenomenon" is often used to refer to whatever manifests through the five senses universally acknowledged by the Western sciences and common sense. Kant, for his part, used the word *phenomena* to indicate the concrete essents appearing as object in our experience, which according to his system, the psyche constructs on the basis of a nonphenomenal *Ding-an-sich* or thing-in-itself, in terms of the *a priori* forms of sensitiveness (the "outer sense" constituted by space and the "inner sense" which is time)—and which subsequently were understood in terms of categories and other *a priori* concepts (or in terms of *a priori* ideas, *a priori* judgments and so on, according to the "department" of the psyche that, according to Kant, in a particular case would be in charge of dealing with them). As will be shown in the next section of the regular text of this chapter, Husserl used the term to refer to the essences that according to his philosophy are the residue of the eidetic reduction that is the first stage in what he called the "phenomenological reduction," and which appear as *noemas* (Husserl's term for the correlates of intentional consciousness or *noesis*).

When I speak of the "*phenomenon of being*" I am *neither* employing the term "phenomenon" in the general sense it has in non-philosophical usage and in various philosophical systems, *nor* in the Kantian sense of what is perceivable in terms of the *a priori* forms of sensibility, *nor* in Husserl's sense of noematic essences resulting from the eidetic reduction. I am using it in an ample sense that is within the bounds of what I call "metaphenomenology" (this term is defined in the following section of the regular text of this chapter): it refers to *whatever manifests in human experience, no matter whether or not it does so through the five senses, whether or not it appears as being spatial, or whether it appears as object or does so as subject*. In fact, what I refer to by the term "metaphenomenology" *does not posit* (yet does not negate) *non-phenomenal realities*.

(However, as I note elsewhere in this book, in Thögel the Gnitiveness associated to the organism is referred to by the Tibetan term semnyi [*sems nyid*], whereas the true nature of the phenomena that in the practice in question manifest in the seemingly outer dimension is called chönyi [*chos nyid*]. If we accept the usual translation into English of the Sanskrit term *dharma* and the Tibetan term chö [*chos*] as "phenomenon," in this context the term in question will appear to refer to whatever manifests as object in the seemingly outer dimension.)

[93] As stated in a note to the first chapter of this book, the term *metaontology* applies to ontological systems which, having been developed by individuals who are very familiar with the dissolution of delusion in *nirvana* or Awakening, acknowledge that the term *being* refers to the most basic phenomenon produced by the basic human delusion that Buddhism calls *avidya* or marigpa (*ma rig pa*) and that Heraclitus called *lethe* or concealment—and which make it clear that Truth is only attained through the dissolution in *nirvana* or Awakening of the *phenomenon of being* and in general of the basic human delusion that Buddhism calls *avidya* or marigpa (*ma rig pa*) and that Heraclitus called *lethe* or concealment: this is what the Dzogchen teachings call *vidya* or rigpa (*rig pa*) and that Heraclitus called *aletheia*.

[94] In fact, *definitio fit per genus proximum et differentiam specificam*: as stated in note 37 (I repeat so that the reader who needs to consult this note does not have to look through all the notes), definition is carried out by naming the immediately wider genus (*genus proximum*) in which the class being defined is included, and the specific difference (*differentia specifica*) of the class in question, which is the characteristic that sets it apart from other classes within the same genus. A classic example used to illustrate this is the definition of the human being as a "rational animal:" "animal" is the *genus proximum*, while "rational" is the *differentia specifica*—and thus the concept of "human" is relative to both that of "animal" and that of "irrational." This shows quite clearly that all contents of thoughts are *relative* to their *genus proximum* and their *differentia specifica*—and, insofar as these are relative to other contents of thoughts that are relative to other contents of thoughts (and so on *ad infinitum*), they are relative to *all other contents of thought* as well. Thus, all phenomena belong to relative truth because they may be singled out and individualized only insofar as they correspond to a concept that is relative to other concepts, in terms of which they are perceived.

[95] It is generally thought that Ashvagosha lived in the second century CE, or partly in the first and partly in the second century CE. According to Western scholarship Nagarjuna lived in the second to third century CE, but according to Tibetan tradition he was born 400 years after Shakyamuni's *parinirvana* or physical death and lived for 600 years; if we assume the founder of Buddhism lived from 560 BC through 480 BC, then this tradition may be read as asserting Nagarjuna lived from 80 BC to 520 CE. Other sources give as the date of Nagarjuna's birth 482 BC, and still others 212 BC. For an account of the various views with regard to Nagarjuna's dating, considering those of Western scholars as well, see Ruegg (1981), pp. 4-6.

Another problem we face when trying to date Nagarjuna's lifetime is that, according to a series of accounts dealing with the transmission of the *Guhyasamajatantra* and with the tradition of the *Treasure of Dohas* by the mahasiddha Sarahapada (for Karma Thinle's account concerning the latter tradition cf. Guenther [1993], pp. 3-7), he was Saraha's lineage-holder. In fact, according to a well-established tradition he received the *Guhyasamajatantra* from the latter, giving rise to the Arya tradition of interpretation of this Tantra, which makes up a whole cycle of teachings (cf. [1] Dudjom Rinpoche [1991], vol. I, p. 464, and vol. 2, p. 36, note 481; [2] Wayman [1973], ch. 2; [3] Wayman [1980], pp. 91-4). Though Herbert V. Guenther (1993, p. 9), among others, claims that this tradition is spurious, in general Tibetans take it quite seriously. If it were true that Saraha lived in the eighth century CE, and if the usual dating of the *Guhyasamajatantra* by Western scholars were also correct, a Nagarjuna who died in 520 CE (the latest of all dates attributed to Nagarjuna's death, rejected by many in the West who cannot accept that

Nagarjuna may have lived for 600 years) could not be the one who received the lineage of Saraha and transmitted the *Guhyasamaja Tantra*. Also the *Hevajratantra*, which was allegedly revealed by Nagarjuna (Dudjom Rinpoche [1991], vol. I, p. 442), is usually considered in the West as being later than the sixth century CE. All of this has led some Western scholars to posit the existence of two Nagarjunas, and attribute to a "second Nagarjuna" the Tantric works Tibetans ascribe to him.

However, the Nagarjuna who, according to the *Chöjung Khepai Gatön* (*chos 'byung mkhas pa'i dga' ston*) by Pawo Tsuglag Threngwa (*dpa' bo gtsug lag phreng ba*), was a link in the transmission of Dzogchen (Namkhai Norbu [1988]), and the Nagarjuna who, as we are told in the *Sutra of Hui-neng* (Wong-Mou-Lam [trans. 1969]), was a link in the transmission of Ch'an, is definitively the Nagarjuna who revealed the *Prajñaparamitasutras* and who founded the Madhyamaka school of philosophy.

96 If, in spite of this fact, one decided to use it, he or she should keep in mind that it cannot correspond to it precisely—it being equally valid and at the same time equally imprecise to call the condition in question "being," as to call it "nonbeing"

97 This view is not followed by Chandrakirti, who in the *Madhyamakavatarabhashya* (*dbu ma la 'jug pa'i bshad pa* / *dbu ma la 'jug pa'i rang 'grel*) asserted that the *dharmata*, the true nature of all phenomena, *exists*—and, furthermore, asserted it to be *self-existent* (edition prepared by De La Vallée Poussin [1970: *Madhyamakavatara par Chandrakirti*. Bibliotheca Buddhica IX, Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag], 305.19-306.12. In the *Lamrim Chenmo* (Dharamsala edition, 416b.6-417a.2; translation in Wayman [1979], p. 256) Tsongkhapa cited this assertion by Chandrakirti. Cf. Napper (2003), pp. 128-9.

98 Pyrrho of Elis lived *circa* 360-270 BC, centuries before the dates Western scholars attribute to Nagarjuna. Only if Nagarjuna had been born in 482 BC or in 212 BC, as some traditions assert, and lived for 600 years, as another tradition affirms, could he and Pyrrho have been contemporaries.

99 As noted by Patrick Carré (1999) and by the author of this book (Capriles [1994a, 1999b]), Pyrrhonic skepticism shows interesting analogies with Madhyamaka philosophy. Marcel Conche (1994, p. 96) writes:

"The 'radical source' of our 'unhappiness' is our belief in (absolute) being, also one of this 'reified projections of human discourse'."

Patrick Carré adds (2001, p. 26):

"Thus being, as its opposite, nonbeing, are perfectly equal in that they are empty words, designations of a meaning too obscure to serve as a basis for a valid cognition of the real. Forced to choose, Pyrrho replies: 'No any more this than that, nor the two (of them), nor nothing (i.e. nor neither of them)'."

(In *Introduction to Metaphysics* [Heidegger 1987] and particularly in a passage that is quoted in this book, as well as in other works, Heidegger intended to refute the opinion that being is an empty word. My view is that Heidegger is right in noting that the word being is not empty, for it indicates a phenomenon—but that Heidegger erred in not realizing this phenomenon to be a most basic manifestation of the delusion that the Buddha Shakyamuni called *avidya* and that Heraclitus named *lethe*. Actually, if the radical source of our unhappiness is our belief in absolute being implies, then the belief in question has very real consequences; therefore, it is not possible to discard altogether the possibility that Pyrrho's words may have being voicing a view similar to the one I have laid out throughout my writings.)

It must be noted that Ignacio Gómez de Liaño (1998) has tried to establish a genetic link between Pyrrhonic skepticism and Madhyamaka philosophy. It is well-known that Pyrrho traveled East with Anaxarchus of Abdera and the troops of Alexander the Great, and that in his travels he met many eastern sages of different traditions—including Buddhist monks and laymen, Gymnosophists, Magi, Brahmins and so on. In fact, it is claimed that he was influenced by the Gymnosophists and the Magi; though the possible influence of the Gymnosophists cannot be discarded altogether (especially in case that, as suggested by Onesycritus of Astipalea [Brown, 1949; Bracht Branham and Goulet-Cazé, 1996], they were similar to the Cynics), the doctrines of Zarathustra could have hardly been more different from those of Pyrrho; therefore, in case he was really influenced by the Magi, these would have been unreformed Zurvanists (a justification of these views is provided in Capriles [work in progress 3]; the said justification also may be inferred from Capriles [2000a and 2000b]). In Capriles (1994a, 1999b), I note that it would be incorrect to discard the possible influence on Pyrrhonic skepticism of the mystical traditions that were reviving in Oddiyana, Sogdia, Bactria and Ferghana, in the form of Mahayana, Vajrayana and Atiyogatantrayana Buddhism—but then I acknowledge that in the lack of concrete proof it would be equally incorrect to affirm such influences.

[100] This applies to the type of thoughts that Kant called "concepts" and placed in the Understanding, but not so to other types of thoughts. However, thoughts are thoughts, and the Kantian compartmentalization of the psyche does not respond to real divisions in the latter.

[101] Of course that Hume does not use the concepts of dang and tsel energy; the association between Hume's view and these concepts was made by the author of this book. The phenomena that Dharmakirti calls *samanyalakshana* or chitsen (*spyi mtshan*)—which following Dreyfus (1997) and in spite of the defects he himself acknowledged in these translation I have referred to as *generally characterized phenomena*—are "representations" in the sense given this term when used as a loose synonym of what Locke, Hume and some "ideologues" termed "ideas." Dharmakirti contrasted them with what he called *swalakshana* (Tib. rangtsen [*rang mtshan*]), which, also following Dreyfus, I render as *specifically characterized phenomena* (but which etymologically could be translated by terms such as "inherent collections of characteristics," "spontaneous collections of characteristics," "self-phenomena," etc.).

Even though the etymology of Dharmakirti's term *samanyalakshana* or chitsen—rendered here as *generally characterized phenomena*—may be taken to mean that these phenomena are what Western philosophy called "universals," this is not at all the case. In order to show why this is so, let me begin by discussing Hume's usage of the term ideas (which he took from Locke and Berkeley but redefined for it to suit his own system). Hume insisted that the mental images he called ideas were particular insofar as they reproduced particular impressions (i.e., sensory perceptions of particular phenomena), and, somehow inverting Berkeley's view (according to which a word becomes general by its relation to a particular but representative idea), he concluded that, because of the resemblances an individual finds in his or her experience between the different patterns or configurations (whether impressions or ideas) indicated by the same word, and the contrast between these patterns and the similar patterns indicated by different words, through custom the individual forms a concept, which Hume also called a "general idea" and which consisted in the combination of an individual idea—which as we have seen is a reproduction of an impression and as such is particular—with the appropriate associative dispositions, which allowed the individual to identify all of the patterns indicated by the same word.

This, however, did not solve the problem he was responding to, for words are learned by means of particular impressions, and learning to identify a sequence of sounds as being the same word on the basis of different impressions of sequences of sound—each of which is different from the others insofar as it involves slightly different tones and intonations of the voice, pronunciations of the word and so on—would be an operation of the same kind as learning to identify the essence indicated by a word on the basis of different particular, mainly visual impressions. In fact, Hume's flaw lied, (1) in his failure to see that the words we use in discursive thinking are also mental images, in this sense belonging to the same category as our mainly visual images of corporeal entities, except in that the former are auditive, and (2) in his failure to acknowledge the existence of what I am calling *comprehensions of essence*, constituted by the intellective intuitions that Greeks called *noein* and that Descartes called intuitive thoughts (but which contrarily to Descartes' belief, rather than being a source of indubitable truth, if taken to be true give rise to delusion) and that the higher Tantras and the Dzogchen teachings call subtle thoughts, which are what can ultimately account for the recognition (in the sense in which authors such as H. H. Price [1975] use the term) of a presentation: though it is true that we must compare our impressions with the mental images associated to words in order to recognize them, this comparison elicits a *comprehension of essence* that is abstract and that in no way could be reduced to the mental image used for comparison. Furthermore, in fantasy and hallucination we may have to recognize our mental images in the same way as we normally have to recognize our impressions. And, what is more important, in discursive reasoning, though we use the mental images of the previous impressions of words, the comprehension of the train of thought depends on the repeated occurrence of comprehensions of essence of the type that Descartes called intuitive thoughts and that the teachings of the higher Tantras and of Dzogchen call subtle thoughts.

Although Hume's position is often deemed to be a conceptualism and as such taken to admit the existence of *universalia post rem*, these are not the mental images he called ideas, which are those that may be said to roughly correspond to Dharmakirti's *samanyalakshana*, chitsen or *generally characterized phenomena*; in Hume's flawed explanation, the universals are what he called concepts or general ideas, as defined in paragraph before last—which unlike Dharmakirti's *samanyalakshana*, chitsen or *generally characterized*

phenomena are not simple mental images, but the result of *associations—between mental images* and between mental images and words. The question would thus be whether or not we are entitled to ascribe to Dharmakirti's *samanyalakshana*, chitsen or *generally characterized phenomena* the function Hume attributed to his ideas, and view them, not as the universals themselves, but as the *prima materia* used in the production of universal concepts. And the only possible reply is that unless we admit the existence of something of a nature wholly different to that of Dharmakirti's *samanyalakshana*, chitsen or *generally characterized phenomena*—namely the abstract comprehensions of essence Descartes called intuitive thoughts and the higher Tantras and the Dzogchen teachings call subtle thoughts—we would be wrong in ascribing a role to *samanyalakshana*, chitsen or *generally characterized phenomena* in the genesis and functioning of universals. In fact, we have seen that Hume's explanation fails to account for the genesis of universals and does not grasp the latter's essence. Far less could Dharmakirti's account for them, since he posits phenomena that are somehow analogous to Hume's ideas, yet does not posit what Hume called concepts or general ideas. Universals—and this applies also to *universalia post rem*—must necessarily consist in abstract comprehensions of essence rather than in mental images which by their nature are particular—even if, as in Hume's case, universals were taken to lie in the association of these images with words and with other images.

Dharmakirti's *samanyalakshana*, chitsen or *generally characterized phenomena* could be of four different types: (1) generic images, (2) images of memory, (3) the posterior image of an object that was perceived through the senses, and (4) imaginary constructions. The first three of these could be loosely said to be "representations" in the sense in which this term was used in the preceding paragraph, and to be instances of something very much like Hume's ideas. What Dharmakirti called (1) generic images (thought not so his [2] images of memory, or [3] the posterior image of an object that was perceived through the senses) first arise in early life, yet in general continue to be modified during the whole of an individual's lifetime, so that the generic images we have at different stages of our lives are not the exact reproduction of the original perception, and at each different stage the image that will enter into play in cognition will the one we have at that stage. For example, when a person, on the occasion of perceiving what Dharmakirti called a *swalakshana*, rangtsen or *specifically characterized phenomenon* of fire (roughly corresponding to what Hume called an impression of fire) learns that this phenomenon is a fire, a generic image of fire is produced that—so long as it is not modified by subsequent perceptions—will take part in obscured perception each and every time the individual intends to cognize a *swalakshana*, rangtsen or *specifically characterized phenomenon* of fire (which as we have seen roughly corresponds to what Hume called an impression of fire), or whenever he or she thinks of fire or imagines fire.

The instant an individual initially perceives what Dharmakirti called a *swalakshana*, rangtsen or *specifically characterized phenomenon* of fire, there is an instant of perception in which an image of the object forms in the eye; however, it does so an instant after the existence reproduced by the image, so that by the time it is perceived the object has already changed—which implies that even in this circumstance the object is not directly apprehended *as it is in the precise moment* when the cognition takes place. Nonetheless, Dharmakirti still asserts that at the moment there is a bare, pure sensation of the effectual, ever-changing *swalakshana*, rangtsen or *specifically characterized phenomenon* of fire, insofar as the image in the eye is not modified by the intervention of the ineffectual phenomenon that does not change during perception that Dharmakirti called a "subsequent image." However, the next moment this bare, pure sensation is replaced by the perception of the "subsequent image" that formed on the basis of the former, and henceforth each and every time the individual perceives a fire, initially there will be an instant of bare, pure sensation of the effectual, ever-changing *swalakshana*, rangtsen or *specifically characterized phenomenon*, but immediately thereafter a perception will occur (i.e., a mental knowledge will arise) having as its object the ineffectual and unchanging during perception *samanyalakshana*, chitsen or *generically characterized phenomenon* that was formed on the basis of the bare, pure sensation of the effectual, ever-changing *swalakshana*, rangtsen or *specifically characterized phenomenon*—which will involve a grave confusion insofar as, on the occasion of thinking "this is a fire," the latter object, which is ineffectual and does not change during its perception, will be mistaken for the effectual, ever-changing *swalakshana*, rangtsen or *specifically characterized phenomenon*. In short, in every cognition there is a first moment in which we apprehend the ever-changing, effectual *specifically characterized phenomenon* (even though we apprehend it *a posteriori*), and a subsequent moment in which what is apprehended is

an ineffectual *generically characterized phenomenon* that does not change during perception, and which therefore could not at all correspond to the former. It is in this sense that the perception in question is deceptive. (This should make it clear that, although for didactic purposes I have compared Dharmakirti's *swalakshana*, rangtsen or *specifically characterized phenomena* with Hume's impressions, they are in fact very different from the latter: as noted below, Dharmakirti's intent is very different from Hume's and from those of most other Western philosophers, and hence his system could not correspond those of any of the latter. The reason for making the comparison in question was that, since Hume's ideas are very similar to Dharmakirti's *samanyalakshana*, chitsen or *generally characterized phenomena*, and since both of them were viewed as originating from a sensory perception, it seemed appropriate to expediently and provisionally relate with each other their respective conceptions of sensory perception—i.e., Hume's impressions and Dharmakirti's apprehension of a *swalakshana*, rangtsen or *specifically characterized phenomenon*.)

However, what we are concerned with is that what Dharmakirti called (1) generic images are not and could not be universals, because they are particular images, and they will continue to be particular images even if they are modified with the passing of time. Furthermore, they would be particular images *even if they became a collage of different* subsequent images of phenomena, for images are forms, and forms cannot be nonparticular insofar as they are collections of particular characteristics: also in the case of a collage of many different forms in which some characteristics came from one perception and others from other perceptions, these characteristics would be particular and so would be the collection of characteristics. Only the *abstract comprehensions of essence* that Descartes called intuitive thoughts and that the higher Tantras and the Dzogchen teachings call subtle thoughts, insofar as they necessarily correspond (to the limited extent to which there can be a correspondence between the abstract and the concrete, the digital and the analogue) to all entities indicated by the same name, may be deemed to be universal and as such nonparticular. (It must be noted that the difference between the mental images that constitute coarse thoughts and the comprehensions of essence that constitute subtle thoughts is not the result of abstract speculation; they are clearly distinguished in the experience of a Dzogchen meditator, who often has to deal with subtle thoughts lacking the support of mental images and has to create the conditions for their spontaneous liberation, and who clearly distinguishes between the presentation of coarse thoughts—whether auditive as in the case of discursive thoughts, or mainly visual—and the immediately posterior understanding of essence they elicit.)

(Concerning Hume, it must be noted that he distinguished between simple and complex ideas; the former always reproduced simple impressions with exactitude, but the latter did not always reproduce complex impressions precisely. Furthermore, according to Hume, besides the impressions of sensation there are impressions of reflection, which include the passions, and which in turn produce ideas of reflection (impressions of reflection arise in the following succession: impression of sensation > perception of sensation > copy of the former impression in the mind and permanence in the mind after the impression has passed > idea > return of the idea to the mind, producing new impressions > impression of reflection). Impressions of reflection gave rise to copies of these ideas by memory and the imagination, which in turn gave rise to ideas of reflection, which in turn produced new impressions and ideas. Therefore, it is clear that we cannot identify Hume's ideas (or Locke's, for that matter) with the conception of the Sautrantikas under discussion, for they are quite different from the latter insofar as they responded to interests different from those of the Buddhists. And the same applies to Quine's conceptions and those of other twentieth century nominalists as well, whose interests are always different from those of Buddhist philosophers.)

For a lengthy, comprehensive, informed, nonsectarian and intelligent discussion of Dharmakirti's system, cf. Dreyfus (1997).

[102] As understood here, universals are *comprehensions of essence*, yet both themselves and the essences they understand are empty of self-existence or substance. Thus *universalia sunt realia sed rursus non sunt vera*: they are real in the etymological sense of the term insofar as they are involved in *rere* (thinking) and in that they understand the essence of *res* (things), yet they are neither absolute truths, nor source of absolute truth understood as an absolutely perfect *adæquatio* with particular essents that would exclude the equally valid, equally partial *adæquatio* of the opposite concept with the same particular essent (whether the latter is an impression or an idea in Hume's sense of the word). On the contrary, universals are the basis for delusion if taken to be the absolute truth concerning what they interpret, and in the light

of the myth of *lila* that is discussed in the following chapter in the context of Heidegger's misinterpretation of Fr. B 52 DK of Heraclitus and its relationship with Fr. B 123 DK of the same author, proving them to be *ante rem*, rather than proving them to be absolute truth, would prove them to be sources of delusion. At any rate, realists certainly have valid grounds for positing universals, and Hume certainly has equally valid grounds to asserting what he called ideas to be particulars—and yet both are wrong in taking their position to be absolutely right and that of their opponents to be absolutely wrong.

[103] In fact, Descartes failed to realize that the subject-object duality was an illusion produced by the delusory valuation-absolutization of the "threefold thought structure" that gives rise to the illusion that there is an experience, something experienced, and an experiencer, or an action, something done and a doer. Believing that the mental subject that arises as a result of the delusory valuation-absolutization of this projection was the supposedly self-existent immaterial entity that Christians call "soul," he asserted the existence of a nonspatial substance called the *res cogitans* or "thinking thing," and believing that the continuum of potential essents appearing as object was a self-existent entity, he asserted the existence of a spatial substance called the *res extensa*. These two were the two created substances, and their creator was the uncreated substance: God.

[104] The condition of possibility of the delusory valuation-absolutization of the less subtle types of thoughts is the delusory valuation-absolutization of the subtler types. For example, for the delusory valuation-absolutization of subtle / intuitive thoughts to come into play in perception, the delusory valuation-absolutization of the threefold thought structure must have given rise to the illusory subject-object duality, and for delusory valued-absolutized coarse thoughts of the discursive type to come into play in reasoning, both the subject-object duality and perception in terms of intuitive thoughts must manifest. Furthermore, there is delusion in discursive thinking only when thoughts are perceived as object and in terms of delusorily-valued intuitive concepts; otherwise, if discursive thoughts arise, they will be like mental sounds that are not interpreted and that hence are not followed, and so they will immediately dissolve rather than having continuity. Finally, in syllogisms and inferential reasoning in general the conclusion is always reached intuitively. Therefore, it is clear that the delusory valuation-absolutization of coarser thoughts depends on that of subtler ones.

"Delusory valuation-absolutization" was also considered in Capriles (2000a, 2000b); in Capriles (1994a) I referred to it by the term "overvaluation".

[105] As shown in note 91, when I speak of the "*phenomenon of being*" I am *neither* employing the term "phenomenon" to refer solely to objects, *nor* in the Kantian sense of what is perceivable in terms of the *a priori* forms of sensibility, *nor* in Husserl's sense of noematic essences resulting from the eidetic reduction. I am using it to refer to *whatever manifests in human experience, no matter whether or not this manifestation takes place through the five senses, whether or not it appears as being spatial, or whether it appears as object or does so as subject*. In fact, what I refer to by the term "metaphenomenology" *does not posit* (yet does not negate) *non-phenomenal realities*.

[106] In logical negation, no-A is the negation of A, and the negation of no-A is A. In phenomenological negation (exemplified by Sartre's "bad faith" and R. D. Laing's "spiral of pretences"), this is not at all the case: whereas no-A is the phenomenological negation of A, the phenomenological negation of no-A, rather than being A, is at twice the phenomenological distance from A than from no-A. This should make it evident that what I call phenomenological negation is not at all the same as Hegel's *Aufhebung* or sublation: the latter does not correspond to any human experience; it is an invention of Hegel's necessary to elaborate his fallacious dialectical view of human evolution and history. (The difference between phenomenological double negation and Hegel's *Aufhebung* or sublation is established in Capriles [work in progress 2], as well as in Part III of this book; previous explanations of it were provided in Capriles [1992, 1994a].)

The fact that, whereas logical negation is reversible (so that when no-A is negated we again have A), like time, phenomenological negation is irreversible (so that the negation of no-A is twice as far from A as no-A), means that the phenomenological is ruled by a special type of logic that is temporal, and therefore that concerning the phenomenological we may speak of a "temporality of logic." (This is not the place to compare my own view of the temporality of the logic ruling the phenomenological, with Heidegger's view of Venezuelan philosopher Lionel Pedrique recently called *Zeitheit der Logik*.)

[107] Of course, I cannot agree that any science may be "neutral." Therefore, when I say I am using the term in Stumpf's sense I only mean that it applies to psychic phenomena as they manifest.

[108] According to Husserl, the sciences would have to be re-founded based on the discovery of essences resulting from the application of the phenomenological method.

[109] This may be compared to the position shared by Shantarakshita, Kamalashila and Je Tsongkhapa, according to which the "mute" intuition of voidness manifesting as object that may result from analysis is the absolute truth of Madhyamaka, and that this truth is concealed by its subsequent enunciation in discursive terms.

[110] Except, of course, in the lapses between perceptions, actions and thoughts in which the condition that the Dzogchen teachings call the neutral base-of-all or kunzhi lungmaten (*kun gzhi lung ma bstan*) manifests for an extremely brief instant.

[111] As we have seen, *avidya qua* the basic human delusion involving the three senses the term has in the threefold classification chosen here, involves experiencing both ourselves and out objects, which are in truth dependent arisings, as involving self-being; experiencing the produced as *given*, and experiencing the falsities that conceal the true condition of reality as *truth itself*.

[112] I follow Chögyal Namkhai Norbu (1996, 1997a, 2004) in tracing the basic core of the current Dzogchen teachings of the Bönpos (*bon po*), on the basis of credible Bönpo sources, to tönpa Shenrab Miwoche, who according to these sources lived about 3,800 years ago (according to other Bönpo sources, tönpa Shenrab lived 16,000 years ago [cf. for example, internet: http://www.tibetanbon.com/history.htm]; however, according to Buddhist sources, the Dzogchen teachings of the Bönpos arose only 1,300 years ago, as they were absorbed from Buddhism).

All Buddhists agree that the core of the current Buddhist Dzogchen teachings arose about 2,000 years ago, their source being tönpa Garab Dorje. (Some Bönpos identify Garab Dorje with Bönpo Dzogchen Master Tapihritsa and claim that the latter, who they claim lived about 3,000 years ago, was the source of the Buddhist Dzogchen tradition. Since this claim is not supported by any evidence whatsoever, it seems to be a sectarian concoction. At any rate, the subject is open to serious research.)

[113] The *ontological difference*, which will be briefly discussed in the next chapter, as originally conceived had to do with this contrast between the ontic and the ontological. However, according to some late works by Heidegger (in particular in Was heisst Denken and in Identität und Differenz), rather than a contrast, the ontological difference is a duplicity (*Zwiefalt*) that must be developed, so that the difference that was previously "undifferentiated," so to say, could be differentiated (i.e. become apparent)—as a result of which being and essent would no longer be in contrast with each other. This view stems from the fact that Heidegger viewed the ontological difference as given within the framework of the *Dasein*.

[114] Whether or not we accept that the metaphenomenological method may be called a "metaontological hermeneutics of human experience and of the surpassing of human experience in *nirvana*," as I show in Capriles (undated, work in progress 3), the only way to properly understand ancient metaontological texts is through a metaontological hermeneutics of these texts—which, just as in the case of the discussed "metaontological hermeneutics of human experience and the surpassing of human experience in *nirvana*," can only be carried out by those who are very familiar with the dissolution of human experience in *nirvana*.

[115] Sartre refers repeatedly to this "transphenomenal being." Furthermore, just as Husserl wrongly believed that by applying his "phenomenological method" he had discovered what he called the "transcendental ego," which he viewed as the absolute being that founded the being of phenomena, Sartre wrongly thought that by means of an equally phenomenological method he had come upon the transphenomenal being he sought. For example, in Sartre (1980), p. 24, we read:

"*We have found a transphenomenal being*, but it is this truly the being to which the phenomenon of being pointed—it is truly the being of the phenomenon?"

[116] The *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* (Tenth Edition, p. 1248) defines "*trans-*" as follows: *prefix* [L. *trans-*, *tra-* across, beyond, through, so as to change, fr, *trans* across, beyond — more at THROUGH] **1**: on or to the other side of: across: beyond <*trans*atlantic> **2a**: beyond (a specified chemical element) in the periodic table <*trans*uranium> **b**: *usu ital*: trans <*trans*-dichloro-ethylene> — compare CIS- 2 **3**: through <*trans*cutaneous> **4**: so or such as to change or transfer <*trans*literate> <*trans*location> <*trans*amination> <*trans*ship>

[117] Alfred Julius Ayer asserted that the problem of being resulted from a bad usage of the term in question. Though this idea may seem to be connected with the thesis expounded in this book according to which being is an error or delusion, it has nothing to do with it, for Ayer does not see the error as lying in being, but as lying in the methodology of the philosophers who occupy themselves with it. Other analytical

philosophers also dealt with the concept in question, but their conclusions are not pertinent to the way the problem is approached in this book.

[118] Nietzsche was following the usual interpretation of Pyrrho's ideas, according to which being is an error because it is "empty words, designations of a meaning too obscure to serve as a basis for a valid cognition of the real." However, in a note to this chapter I expressed my idea that Pyrrho *might* have been aware that the delusory valuation-absolutization of the concept of being begot the *phenomenon of being*, which he knew to be delusory, and thus that his position *may* have been quite similar to the one expressed in this book—which does not seem to be the case with Nietzsche.

[119] The Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary Unabridged (Second Edition-Deluxe Color) lists 10 different meanings of the word "absolute." The following are particularly relevant to our discussion: **1**. Literally, in a general sense, free or independent from anything extraneous. **4**. Existing independent of any other cause; as, God is *absolute*. **6**. Not relative; as, *absolute* space. **7**. In chemistry, pure; unmixed; as, absolute alcohol. **8**. Free from imperfection; perfect. **9**. Actual; real; as, an absolute truth. Thus here we are concerned with sense **6**, but also with sense **1** (the independence regarding anything extraneous of sense **1** implies senses **4**, **6** and **7**), with sense **4**, with sense **7** and with sense **8**. Conversely, sense **9** corresponds to that which Madhyamaka philosophy calls actual relative truth (Skt. *tathyasamvritisatya*; Tib. yangdak kundzob [*yang dag kun rdzob*] or yangdakpai kundzob denpa [*yang dag pa'i kun rdzob bden pa*]) (Tib.)—in contrast with ineffectual relative truth (Tib. lokpai kundzob [*log pa'i kun rdzob*])—and which implies the capacity to produce effects, but which is set in opposition to absolute truth.

[120] Marcel Conche (1994, p. 88) summarizes the ideas that, on the basis of extant sources, he concludes Pyrrho espoused:

Comment se rendre heureux? *En discernant d'abord la source radicale du malheur de l'homme*. *Pyrrhon la trouve dans l'idée de l'être*. (*How to become happy? By first discerning the radical source of man's unhappiness*. *Pyrrho finds it in the idea of being*.)

As Patrick Carré has noted (Carré, 2001, pp. 25-27), this reasoning is reminiscent of the Mahayana version of Shakyamuni's first two noble truths.

[121] Heidegger (1987) is a German-supremacist, panliguistic work claiming that the only language in which philosophy is possible is German (and were it possible in another language, that language would be Greek). However, I do not find any value in mere, dry speculation: I think a system of ideas has supreme value if it serves as the base of an effective method of Awakening, and has relative value if it helps bettering society and the condition of individuals in it. Since most of German philosophy (with the possible exception of the works of a few mystical philosophers and theologians, including Nicholas of Cusa, Meister Eckhart and so on) is unlikely to be useful on the Path of Awakening, it lacks supreme value. Though Marxian philosophy had actual political results, more often than not these failed to better society or the lot of the individual in it (except economically in the case of the most deprived layers of society, and even in this case at the price of individual freedom), and though some German anarchists may have developed valuable theories, they were never implemented—and, at any rate, Heidegger's conception of "philosophy" excluded Marx's thought and the views developed by German Anarchists. Therefore, if the only philosophy is the one written in German, then philosophy is mostly worthless.

[122] It is well known that Aristotle understood being to be the most general of concepts, yet not to be a category: it was neither the highest category, nor "the category of all categories."

[123] Definition is made in terms of *genus proximum*, which is always a concept ampler than the one being defined, and of *differentia specifica*, which is always a concept of the same extension as the one being defined. Due to the very essence of definition, narrower concepts cannot help in definition.

[124] Cf. the note before last.

[125] I believe here we should have "nonbeing" rather than "nothing," for being is no-thing (as it is the being of things but not itself a thing), and thus "nothing" is not the opposite of "being:" the opposite of being is nonbeing.

[126] At this point Heidegger goes on with the argument quoted in the preceding citation (which appears in Heidegger [1987], pp. 79-82). After the end of the citation in question, he adds:

"But before we resume our endeavor to find out what process is at work in this fact, let us make one last attempt to take it as something familiar and indifferent. Let us assume that this fact does not exist…"

(The continuation of the above follows the paragraph to which the reference mark for this note was appended in the regular text of this book.)

[127] The fact that some non-Indo-European languages do not have the verb "to be" or the corresponding noun merely indicated that they are *implicit* in them—just as in some sense it can be said that languages with casual flexion implicitly contain prepositions. At any rate, the verb and noun in question become increasingly necessary as degenerative evolution proceeds.

[128] As explained elsewhere in the regular text, it is also this that gives rise to the already mentioned appearance of insubstantiality / lack of self-existence that may manifests both in some meditation practices and in experiences of "psychotic derealization."

[129] Albert Hofstadter translates the term *vorhanden* as "extant" rather than "available essent." I took the term "essent" from Max Niemeyer (Heidegger [1987]) and added the adjective "available" in order to be faithful both to the etymological sense of *vorhanden* and to Heidegger's usage of the term.

"Available essents" are those essents that, not having the mode of existence of the human existent Heidegger called *Dasein*, are available to the human existent or *Dasein*. Though traditionally these essents were called "existents," Heidegger thought the new philosophy his time required had to invert the usage of the term and apply it to the human essent, which is the *ek-sistent* or *Dasein*. (To give an example: in Part Two of Heidegger [1988], it was made clear that it is the *Dasein* and not nonhuman essents that may be deemed to be transcendent ["the essent that lies beyond, the otherworldly essent," is the translation of Heidegger [1988], § 20, p. 424 of original German Ed. after the terminological changes I introduced], for it is the *Dasein* that is, in its being, "as such out beyond itself" (*ibidem*, § 20, p. 300 [p. 425 of original German Ed.]), and it is the *Dasein* that has three "ecstasies" (that of the future, that of the present and that of the past: cf. *ibidem*, §§ 20-21)—which may be said to be, so to say, "being-carried-away-toward [a horizon]" or "enraptured-toward [a horizon]:" the term "ecstasy" should not be understood in a mystical sense.)

I rejected the term "extant" used by Hofstadter because the only non obsolete sense of the word is that of "still existent; not extinct; not destroyed or lost" (Webster's Twentieth Century Dictionary Unabridged, Second Edition, 1979), which has hardly anything to do with the sense Heidegger gave the German term *vorhanden*, and because of its etymological roots, which are common with those of terms such as "existence," "ecstasy" and so on (*ibidem*)—all of which Heidegger applies to the *Dasein* but not so to available essents. (However, one of the obsolete senses of "extant" is more or less appropriate: that of "standing out or above any surface; protruding" [*ibidem*], which corresponds to the sense of the Latin *exstant-exstantis*—which, besides, has the sense of "subsistent, showing itself, existent.")

[130] Below I copy a revised and improved excerpt from Capriles (2004) (the definitive, corrected version of which will soon be available in print):

In his writings, Chandrakirti asserted several times that emptiness was not the absence of existence, but the absence of what he chose to call 'inherent existence' or 'true existence'—a clear example of this distinction being the difference between the presence in the world of the pattern we call 'a pot' and the functionality of this configuration, on the one hand, and our delusive apprehension of the pattern in question as having a self-nature (Skt. *swabhava*; Tib. rangzhin [*rang bzhin*]) and hence as being a self-existent pot, on the other hand. Je Tsongkhapa, who had spent years trying to ascertain the meaning of the Madhyamaka, considered the distinction between mere existence (Tib. yöpa tsam [*yod pa tsam*]) and true existence (Tib. denpar yöpa [*bden par yod pa*]) or inherent existence (Tib. rangzhingyi yöpa [*rang bzhin gyis yod pa*])—which was extremely rare in the canonical texts of the Mahayana and in the original Tibetan translations of those texts, and was virtually nonexistent in Nyingmapa and in general pre-Gelugpa treatises of the Land of the Snows—to be so important that he systematically qualified as 'inherent' or 'true' the existence that was the object of negation in Madhyamika refutations and added the term "inherent" to the word "existence" in Tibetan translations of Sanskrit Madhyamika texts—though he did not do so each and every time the term was used. (Occasionally, in some sutras we find the term 'existence' qualified by an adjective or modified by an adverb; for example, in the *Sutra of the Wisdom that Leads Beyond* [*Samsara*] *in 100,000 Stanzas* [Skt. *Shatasahasrikaprajñaparamitasutra*; Tib. *Sher phyin stong phrag brgya pa mdo*] we find the term 'existence' qualified as 'absolute' or 'ultimate' [Skt. *paramartha*; Tib. döndam: *don dam*]. In their turn, in the works by Nagarjuna, we find in a few occasions the term 'inherent existence' [Skt. *swabhava*; Tib. rangzhin: *rang bzhin*]. However, in the works by Chandrakirti the term 'inherent existence' is found quite a few times. For a discussion of this, see Napper [2003], pp. 33-38.)…

The reason why the distinction between 'mere existence' and 'inherent existence' or 'true existence' is hardly applicable to the experience of sentient beings is because, so long as we are in *samsara*, whenever

we perceive something as *existing* or as *being* (or think of something as *existing* or as *being*) the super-subtle threefold thought structure that posits a subject and an object and that attributes *self-existence* to the subject and *self-being* to the object is delusorily valued, giving rise to what Je Tsongkhapa and his Gelugpa followers refer to as the 'illusion of inherent existence' or 'illusion of true existence' of both subject and object. Therefore, for us sentient beings in *samsara*, the term 'existence' *always* refers to a *delusive phenomenon* manifesting in our experience (which is what Tsongkhapa, following Chandrakirti, systematically called 'inherent existence' or 'true existence')—*whether or not it refers to being* qua *actuality as well*. Conversely, when we go beyond *samsara* we no longer perceive anything as *existing* or as *being*.

When someone thinks 'this is a pot', the delusory valuation-absolutization of the super-subtle threefold thought structure gives rise to the *delusive phenomenon of being*, which is what the Gelugpas call 'illusion of true existence', and the delusory valuation-absolutization of the concept of 'pot' gives rise to the illusion that what is 'truly existent' is a pot. When the intuitive equivalent of the thought 'this is a pot' occurs in the recognition of the configuration we call 'pot', though we have not yet thought in a discursive manner 'this is a pot' (i.e. we have not mentally pronounced the words 'this is a pot'), we equally have the illusion that the pot exists in the manner that the Gelugpas refer to as 'inherent' or 'truly'. The reason for this is *not* that (as some Gelugpas claim) there is a second thought that establishes that the pot exists *truly*. Firstly, human beings who are ignorant of Madhyamika philosophy do not make the difference between 'true existence' and 'mere existence', and therefore they could never have a discursive thought (which as we have seen is a type of coarse thought) asserting 'this is a truly existing pot'—nor could they have the equivalent subtle / intuitive thought, for it is impossible to make a difference intuitively that one has not previously learned with the help of discursive thinking. Secondly, the human mind cannot entertain more than one thought of the same class at the same time. Therefore, the illusion that the pot exists in the manner that the Gelugpas refer to as 'truly', is a function of what I have called the delusory valuation-absolutization of the super-subtle threefold thought structure in combination with the delusory valuation-absolutization of the subtle / intuitive concept understanding it as a pot.

In the gradual Mahayana, the Path is described in terms of five successive stages called "paths" [Skt. *marga*; Tib. *lam*], and eleven levels [Skt. *bhumi*; Tib. *sa*] that are stages of the last three of the five successive paths in question. In human beings who have not set upon the Path, all is conventional truth, for absolute truth does not manifest. According to Prasangika philosophy, in the third path, corresponding to the first level, the practitioner becomes a superior bodhisattva, beginning to oscillate between a Contemplation state in which absolute truth manifests and so there is neither being *qua* actuality not being *qua* illusion of self-being, and a post-Contemplation state in which conventional truth is reestablished and thus there is both being *qua* actuality and being *qua* delusion of self-being. This oscillation continues throughout the fourth path, corresponding to levels two through ten, and only ends upon attainment of the fifth path, corresponding to the eleventh level, for at that point the individual has become a Buddha who lives in the condition of absolute truth and in whom conventional truth no longer manifests.

Therefore, in terms of the conceptions proper of the gradual Mahayana, it must be acknowledged that only fully Awake Ones (i.e. Buddhas) can use the terms 'existence' and 'being' without giving rise to the *delusive phenomenon of being* and the ensuing illusion of self-existence—i.e. to what Tsongkhapa referred to as the illusion of inherent or true existence. In fact, fully Awake Ones are free from what Chandrakirti called *own mind* and so, as will be shown in a note to a subsequent chapter of this book, they do not experience thoughts and words as being in themselves true or false: no matter what thought may cross their fields of awareness or what word may come out from their mouths, nothing will happen in their hearts—and, if they are connected to a polygraph, the machine will not register a lie whether they assert one thing or its opposite.

Ordinary beings, insofar as they are subject to the first of the three senses the terms *avidya* and *ma rig pa* have in the threefold classification chosen here, are unaware of the true condition of reality. Insofar as they are subject to the second of these three senses, they conceive the *phenomenon of being* and are subject to the illusion of self-existence that Tsongkhapa called the illusion of inherent or true existence. And insofar as they are subject to the third of these senses, they are utterly unaware of the fact that the *phenomenon of being* and the illusion of self-existence (what Tsongkhapa called the illusion of inherent

or true existence), are manifestations of delusion. Because of all of this, they find themselves in the state that Prasangika Madhyamaka calls inverted or wrong relative truth (Skt. *mithyasamvritisatya*; Tib. logpai kundzob denpa [*log pa'i kun-rdzob bden-pa*]), in which the individual is deluded and does not realize he or she is deluded.

In their turn, superior bodhisattvas, who in their Contemplation state (Skt. *samahita*; Tib. nyamzhak [*mnyam bzhag*]) apprehend the absolute truth of the Mahayana, in their post-Contemplation state (Skt. *prishthalabdha*; Tib. jethob [*rjes thob*]) experience the *delusive phenomenon of being* and the ensuing illusion of self-existence; however, they do so to a somehow lower degree than normal individuals—and, what is most important, they have a residual awareness of the fact that the phenomenon in question is but an illusion. Prasangika Madhyamaka refers to the experience of superior bodhisattvas in their post-Contemplation state by the term *correct / sound relative truth* (Skt. *tathyasamvritisatya*; Tib. yangdagpai kundzob denpa [*yang dag pa'i kun rdzob bden pa*]) because, though these bodhisattvas are under the obscuration to correctness implied by the Sanskrit term *samvriti*, rendered as "relative truth," they have some awareness of the fact that their experience involves this obscuration. Therefore, in the phrase *correct / sound relative truth* the terms "correct" and "sound" make the point that *their awareness of being under delusion is correct or sound*; they do not indicate that their experience if correct or sound in the sense of being free from delusion. In fact, in the post-Contemplation state of these bodhisattvas being *qua* actuality (Skt. *arthakriyashakti*; Tib. dönche nüpa [*don byed nus pa*]), corresponding to what Tsongkhapa referred to by the term "mere existence" and pertaining to conventional truth (Skt. *vyavaharasatya*; Tib. thanyekyi denpa [*tha snyad kyi bden pa*]) and to relative truth (Skt. *samvritisatya*; Tib. kundzob denpa [*kun rdzob bden pa*]), and being *qua* illusion of self-being, corresponding to what Tsongkhapa called the illusion of "inherent or true existence," manifest as a single phenomenon and hence cannot be distinguished from each other. In the Contemplation state of these bodhisattvas, the two simultaneously cease to arise, albeit in a temporary way, and upon the attainment of definitive Buddhahood the two simultaneously cease to occur in a definitive way. The point we are concerned with here, however, is that, insofar as in their post-Contemplation state they have a residual awareness of the fact that the *phenomenon of being* / the illusion of self-being / the illusion of inherent existence is but an illusion, these bodhisattvas can *mentally disassemble* their experience of being and distinguish between being *qua* actuality, on the one hand, and being *qua* the illusion of self-being (i.e. that which Tsongkhapa called the illusion of true existence or of inherent existence), on the other—just as one can *artificially* distinguish between the redness of a tomato and the shape of the vegetable. However, it must be reiterated that the fact that both being *qua* actuality and being *qua* the illusion of self-being occur only in *samsara* and disappear in *nirvana*, and the fact that, as Gendün Chöphel (2005) made it clear, both involve "obscuration to correctness" and being "thoroughly confused," should make it clear that both are manifestations of delusion that are to be surpassed together in Awakening.

Thus ordinary deluded beings, who are the ones in need of treading the Path, insofar as in their experience, 'existence' is always understood to refer to the phenomenon that Tsongkhapa called 'inherent existence" or 'true existence', cannot distinguish 'mere existence' from 'inherent existence' or 'true existence'. (The same applies to the distinction between distinctive marks [Skt. *lakshana*; Tib. tsennyi: *mtsan nyid*] and self-existing distinctive marks [Skt. *swalakshana*; Tib. rangtsen: *rang mtshan*]: in the experience of ordinary beings, distinctive marks are always experienced as self-existing distinctive marks). How could they find the "inherent existence" that is to be negated, while leaving alone the "mere existence" that according to Tsongkhapa is not to be negated? We read in Chöphel (2005):

"Those who have realized Emptiness are able to appropriately and definitely distinguish between form that should be negated and form that need not be negated. [However, this is not so in the case of ordinary people, for] when [the illusion that] form is truly real and [merely] existing form are mixed together as one thing, then the ideas ordinary people have about denying some things and leaving others is just like saying that the trunk of an illusory elephant can be left, while its legs are negated."

Or, rather, like denying the redness of a ripe tomato while not denying its tomato shape. Of course, there is a standard Gelugpa reply to this, which is that if we apply Tsongkhapa's method, the illusion of inherent or true existence will disappear, whereas "mere existence" will remain. However, the point is that both are manifestations of delusion to be overcome, and so even if it were possible to keep one of them and we actually did so, there would be no end to *samsara*. Therefore, Gendün Chöphel was right in noting that the distinction that Tsongkhapa introduced between "mere existence" and "[the illusion of] inherent

existence" was at best superfluous. Furthermore, original Madhyamika terminology already distinguished between existence in the sense of an essent's capacity to produce effects—i.e. as *actuality* (in German, *Wirlichkeit*)—or, which is the same, in the sense of not being a mere illusion, and the delusive *phenomenon of being* or illusion of self-existence. The Sanskrit term *bhava* and the Tibetan term ngöpo (*dngos po*, traduced as "thing," "existence," "becoming" and so on, according to the context) could always be understood (1) as referring to an essent's capacity to produce effects, or which is the same, to its *actuality*, which as shown in the regular text of this chapter is indicated by the Sanskrit term *arthakriyashakti* and the Tibetan term dönche nüpa (*don byed nus pa*), or (2) as meaning "self-existence," which as also shown in the regular text of this chapter is the meaning of the Sanskrit term *swabhava* and the Tibetan noun rangzhin (*rang bzhin*). Since the original philosophical language of the Madhyamaka School already made this distinction between an essent's actuality and the illusion that the essent is self-existent, there was no need whatsoever to introduce the supplementary distinction between "mere existence" (Tib. yöpa tsam) and "true existence" (Tib. denpar yöpa).

In English, we think of an essent that is capable of producing effects as being "actual," but we can also say with regard to it that it "truly exists" so that our interlocutors understand that it does not have the type of illusory existence that is proper of the baseless appearances of fantasy, imagination, dream, hallucination and so on, but is endowed with *actuality*. Conversely, as we have already seen, when we think of "being" or "existence," what manifests to our mind is the delusive appearance of self-being Tsongkhapa called "inherent existence" or "true existence." Therefore, the terminological precision emphasized by Tsongkhapa does not help us to better understand the philosophy of Madhyamaka; contrariwise, it is likely that the term "true existence" be wrongly understood as referring to an essent's *actuality* rather than to the illusion of self-existence or substance, or lead us to believe it refers to some strange thing we are not familiar with rather than to the delusive phenomenon that manifests when we experience something as *being* or *existing*. The last point was acknowledged even by a follower and apologist of Tsongkhapa like Elizabeth Napper, who wrote (2003, p. 147, and p. 724 note 281):

"(There is a serious) danger that, because Tsongkhapa chose to emphasize a verbal distinction between existence and inherent existence which cannot be realized in ordinary experience, people will miss the Madhyamika message altogether. They will not understand that Madhyamika is attacking and refuting *our very sense of existence* and, misled by the verbal emphasis on "inherent existence," will see Madhyamika as refuting something merely intellectual, "out there," not immediate. In spite of cautions from within the Gelugpa tradition that inherent existence should not be seen as like a hat to be put on the head and then taken off again, it is almost impossible to read Tsongkhapa without falling into such error, and Tsongkhapa has been criticized on this point even from within the Gelugpa tradition."

Therefore, rather than distinguishing between mere existence and [the illusion of] true existence, or between mere existence and [the illusion of] inherent existence, I find it more appropriate to distinguish between *actuality* and what I have chosen to call *the delusive phenomenon of being*, which gives us the illusion of self-being (or "delusive phenomenon of existence which gives us the illusion of self-existence"). Tsongkhapa emphasized the distinction in question because he feared practitioners of analysis with regard to absolute truth might "negate too much" and thus develop a nihilistic view. However, as Gendün Chöphel (2005) rightly noted:

"Some people are afraid that if we deny the existence of pots and pillars, then we descend into a nihilistic view where nothing exists, but this is a meaningless anxiety. How can ordinary people produce the nihilistic thought that the pot they see in front of them does not exist at all?

"Indeed, if such a thought did arise, because they know from direct experience that they see the pot and feel the pot, they would spontaneously begin to think, 'Even though this pot appears before me, it doesn't exist in any way as it appears'. And that thought [perfectly fits] the middle view between appearance and emptiness; it is the understanding that though things do appear, they do not exist as they appear. It would be absurd to call it a nihilistic view.

"In general, whenever the thought 'the pot doesn't exist at all' occurs at the same time one actually sees a pot, the comprehension of the apparitional nature of phenomena will arise, so there is no danger of descending into nihilistic view.

"When your mind says it is not
While your eyes clearly see it;

Even though you have not studied under the Yellow Hats
What else is this but mind realizing apparitional nature?

"When you throw gold, rocks, and weeds all together in a fire without sorting them, the flammable things burn and the nonflammable ones are left. Likewise, if you analytically deny all appearances without sorting them, the world of apparitions will still remain. What need is there to sort out the apparition-like world of relativity from the start out of fear it would be harmed by logic?"

Furthermore, since what is realized through Tsongkhapa's method is apparitional nature, one wonders how does his view and method differ from that of reason-established illusionists [Skt. *mayopamadvayavadin*; Tib. *sgyu ma rigs grub pa smra ba*]). And, in fact, what Tsongkhapa did was to adopt the method proper of the latter to the tenets of Madhyamaka Prasangika.

Back to our subject, the distinction between an essent's actuality (which as we have seen is what Tsongkhapa called "mere existence") and the delusive phenomenon elicited by the terms "being" and "existence" (which as we have seen is what Tsongkhapa called "illusion of inherent existence" or "illusion of true existence"), implies the analogous distinction between the presence of the absence of the first—which Tsongkhapa called "mere nonexistence" (Tib. mepa tsam [*med pa tsam*])—and the presence of the absence of the second—which Tsongkhapa called "lack of true existence" (Tib. denpar mepa [*bden par med pa*]) or "lack of inherent existence" (rangzhingyi mepa [*rang bzhin gyis med pa*]), and which in his *Lamrim* works he posited as the voidness and the absolute truth of Madhyamaka Prasangika.

This distinction may be easily grasped in terms of an example: what Tsongkhapa called mere nonexistence is the nonexistence of a pot that, for example, broke into pieces, or was never made, etc. (which, in the case of the pot that broke into pieces, may be compared to a yak's missing horn); in turn, what he called lack of true existence or lack of inherent existence is the lack of the self-existence (Skt. *swabhava*; Tib. rangzhin) that, while the pot was still perceivable as a pot, deluded beings in *samsara* wrongly perceived it as having. Insofar as the latter type of existence is something that never was, it may be compared to a hare's horn—except for the fact that all beings in *samsara* wrongly perceive all essents as having this type of existence, but it would be very difficult to find someone who sees hares as having horns. As noted above, it is the presence of the absence of this type of existence that, in the practice of *vipashyana* taught in Tsongkhapa's *Lamrim* works, must appear at the term of this analysis to the mind applying the analysis. However, whenever the presence of an absence appears as an object to the mind, the subject-object duality that results from the delusory valuation-absolutization of the super-subtle threefold thought structure is involved, and therefore that presence is necessarily sustained by the delusive phenomenon of being that results from the delusory valuation-absolutization of the same super-subtle thought structure (i.e. the presence in question will *necessarily* be charged with illusory truth, value and importance)—which is another instance of delusion, which Gelugpas should then refer to as 'illusion of true nonexistence' or 'illusion of inherent nonexistence', but which, rather than so calling it, they *do not at all view as an illusion*. On the contrary, they equate the ensuing presence of an absence with *swabhava* or "self-sufficient nature," which they use as a synonym of *shunyata* or emptiness and view as the absolute truth of Prasangika Madhyamaka!

This distinction is relevant to the understanding of Buddhahood: in the fully Awake state, the total dynamic configuration of the continuum of sense-data from which deluded beings single out segments which they experience as objects, continues to be manifest, but it does not appear as object. Likewise, the *delusive phenomenon* of *being* or *existence* does not manifest. And since the delusive phenomenon consisting in perceiving the object as *being* or as *existing* (in Tsongkhapa's terminology, as *existing inherently*) does not manifest, the presence of the absence of this supposed *existence* also could not manifest. Therefore, Tsongkhapa is *right* in stating that absolute *prajña* wisdom does not negate.

(For an in-depth discussion of Tsongkhapa's view of voidness and method of meditation, cf. Capriles [2005], and in general Gendün Chöphel [2005], as well as the upcoming definitive version of Capriles [2004].)

[131] Shortly after the passage quoted below in the regular text of this book, in Thinley Norbu (1985), p. 41 (1st ed. p. 25), we find a "higher Madhyamaka" version of the list reproduced in the quote:

"'Collectively perceived', like the eight examples of *maya*: magic, a dream, a bubble, a rainbow, lightening, the moon reflected in water, a mirage, and the city of the celestial musicians (Skt. gandharvas; Tib. *dri za*);

"'Capable of entering into function' because with the realization that all phenomena are like the eight examples of *maya*, *samsara* can be abandoned and *nirvana* can be attained;

"'Produced by root cause and conditions' because of the realization of the illusory nature of phenomena. The root cause of this realization is the two accumulations of merit and wisdom. The contributing circumstance, or necessary condition, is the teachings of the precious teacher; and

"'Nonexistent when examined' because, actually, there is not even illusion; all phenomena, existence, nonexistence, truth and untruth are total emptiness (in the original, 'great emptiness')."

[132] As stated in the preceding note, this is what Tsongkhapa called "inherent being" (Tib. rangzhingyi yöpa [*bden par yod pa*]) or "true being" (Tib. denpar yöpa [*rang bzhin gyis yod pa*]).

[133] As shown in a previous note, even for superior bodhisattvas in their post-Contemplation state these two always go together: though in them the appearance of self-being is less powerful than in ordinary individuals, and though they have some awareness of the fact that this appearance is a mere illusion, so long as they have not attained final Buddhahood and therefore continue to have a post-Contemplation state, in this state being *qua* actuality and being *qua* the delusion of self-being are indivisible in their experience.

[134] As will be shown in a note to vol. II of this book, this name is not precise insofar as Buddhas perceive no others—i.e. no sentient beings to save from *samsara*—and no exterior—i.e. no limits between an internal dimension and an external one. In fact, in the *Bodhicharyavatara* we read:[134]

"[Objection] How can there exist a liberated being?

"[*Madhyamika*] He is false imagination in the mind of another, but he does not exist because of conventional truth *on his own part*. After something has been established it exists; if not, it does not exist even as conventional truth."

The above means that Buddhists who lived at the time of Shakyamuni through their false imagination perceived Shakyamuni as a Buddha, but Shakyamuni, who was not subject to false imagination, neither perceived himself as a Buddha, nor perceived others as deluded sentient beings; therefore, in all that he asserted there was no own-mind. The stanzas by Shantideva coincide with Jigme Lingpa's assertion that, though sentient beings—provided that they are devout Buddhists and are able to recognize the Buddhas as such—may perceive Buddhas as carrying out countless activities on their behalf, Buddhas perceive no beings to be helped, and harbor no intentions to help beings. The point is that, since Buddhas do not delusorily value-absolutize the threefold thought structure (Tib. *'khor gsum*), whatever they do is an instance of what is called "action and fruit [of action] devoid of the concept of the three spheres" (*'khor gsum rnam par mi rtog pa'i las dang 'bras bu*): from their own standpoint they are beyond activity, even though others may perceived them as acting. This is why the terms "other-directed" and "exterior-directed" do not categorize the actionless activities of the Buddhas precisely: Buddhas perceive no others and no exterior, and therefore, although for lack of a better term we call their assertions "other-directed" or "exterior-directed," in truth these belong to a category different from that of the "exterior-directed" or "other-directed" assertions made by sentient beings—which are the lies they say—and properly speaking should not be referred to by the same words. And this is also why "purpose" is a term that does not apply to the Buddhas.

(Furthermore, Shantideva's words make it clear that no phenomenon can be said to exist as conventional truth unless deluded mind has established it as existing—which is relevant with regard to the distinction between being *qua* actuality and being *qua* the illusion of self-being.)

[135] Kant also refers to what he calls "actual" or "effective" (*wirlich*), as "objective reality" (*objektive realität*).

[136] In Heidegger (1988), last lines of p. 51 and very first lines of p. 52 in the German Ed. p. 39 of English Ed. we read:

"What is more, the expression 'is' in the broadest sense is involved in every predication, even when I do not posit as existent that about which I am judging and predicating, even when I merely say, 'Body, by its very nature, is extended'—whether a body exists or not. Here I am also using an 'is', the 'is', in the sense of the copula, which is distinct from the 'is' when I say 'God is', that is, 'God exists'. Being as copula, as linking concept, and being in the sense of existence must consequently be distinguished."

[137] "Reality belongs among the categories of quality. Existence [in the pre-Heideggerian sense of] actuality or effectiveness belongs, in contrast, among the categories of modality. Reality is a category of quality. By quality Kant refers to that character of judgmental positing which indicates whether a predicate is ascribed to a subject [in the grammatical, syntactic sense of the term 'subject'], whether it is affirmed of

the subject or opposed to it, that is, denied of it. Reality is accordingly the form of unity of the affirming, affirmative, positing, positive judgment. This is precisely the definition that Baumgarten gives of reality. In contrast, existence, or actuality, belongs to the class of categories of modality. Modality expresses the attitude of the cognizing subject to that which is judged in the judgment. The concept complementary to existence or actuality is not negation, as in the case of reality, but either possibility or necessity. As a category, existence corresponds to the assertoric judgment, which is simply assertive, whether positive or negative." (Heidegger [1988], pp. 48-49 of original German Ed. pp. 36-37 of this English translation, which I modified whenever I deemed it convenient or necessary.)

Furthermore, in Chapter Three of the *Grundprobleme* Heidegger deals in depth with the meaning of "being" in the copulative usage of the verbal form "is," considering it mainly with regard to the thinking of Aristotle, Hobbes, Mill, and Lotze. Since a discussion of the conceptions of each of these authors would be beyond the intended scope of this book, I leave it to interested readers to compare the positions of each of the authors in question with the essential views expressed in this book, and arrive at their own conclusions. (The reason why such a discussion would be beyond the intended scope of this book is that it would lie almost exclusively within the field of phenomenology, and only some of its conclusions would lie within the scope of what I have called metaontological metaphenomenology, which is the subject of this section of the present book.)

Finally, concerning truth, it is important to keep in mind that all that Heidegger says in this regard may be applied only to the experience of what deluded beings may call "truth," but that whatever deluded beings call "truth" is delusion and therefore untruth from the standpoint of Madhyamika philosophy and of Buddhism in general. This was briefly reviewed in a previous note, and will be considered in the following chapter, in the context of a discussion of Heraclitus' concepts of *lethe* and *aletheia* as understood by Heidegger and as understood by Heraclitus himself, as well as in a note to vol. II of this book.

[138] As we know, Kant conceived an extra-experiential *Ding-an-sich* or thing-in-itself involving neither space and time, nor causality, substance and so on, and asserted that in human experience a compartment of the psyche called "Sensibility" structured this *Ding-an-sich* in terms of space and time, which were the so-called *a priori* forms of sensibility; that another compartment of the psyche called "the Understanding" structured it in terms of causality, substance and the rest of the categories and other *a priori* concepts of the understanding, and so on. Therefore, it was logical that he reserved the term "perception" for those occasions in which experience was produced by the psyche in terms of the *a priori* forms of sensibility, the *a priori* categories and other concepts of the understanding, and so on, *on the basis of the* Ding-an-sich *and by following the legitimate procedures for the production of experience.*

[139] As will be shown in Part II of this book, firstly the delusory valuation of the threefold thought structure gives rise to both the phenomenon of being and the subject-object duality, and so the undivided sensory continuum is taken as object and experienced as a totality that *is*. Then a segment of the sensory continuum is singled out and understood as being this or that particular essent. And then the subject reacts to the object emotionally. In this way, the three realms of *samsara* manifest: to begin with, the formless realms arise; then the realm of form manifests, and finally there arises the realm of sensuality.

[140] The subject cannot experience other subjects as object; as Sartre noted and as Louis Lavelle had suggested some time before him, the subject can only experience other subjects in the experience of *becoming the essent appearing as object that is being perceived by another subject.* Sartre gives us an example of this: one is looking through a keyhole, unaware of one's own self, until one sees "through the corner of the eye" that one is being watched. That very moment, the mental subject becomes the object that the other is watching, and which includes the physical body that one experiences as "one's own body," the mind associated to that body, and so on,

[141] Sartre used the term *être-pour-Soi*, which does not mean being-for-itself, but being-for-Self: this mode of being is called being-for-Self because one of the senses Sartre gave the term Self corresponds to what he called *holon*, which consisted in a Totality wherein there was no opposition or duality between being-for-Self and what Sartre called being-in-itself—a Totality that he likened unto God and deemed impossible to attain, but which it would be more precise to equate to Dzogchen *qua* Fruit and which can certainly be attained. Sartre called the being of human consciousness *être-pour-Soi* because this mode of being yearns to attain the *Soi* (Self) or *holon* and lives only for achieving this possibility (which, as just noted, he considered to be an impossibility): the being of human consciousness is thus a being-for-the-*holon* or

being-for-the-Self; therefore, the correct translation of the term would not be being-for-itself, but being-for-Self.

By redefining the concept of Self so that is corresponds to that of Dzogchen, in this book I will distinguish between the Self *qua* Base, the Self *qua* Path and the Self *qua* Fruit.

[142] The etymology of the term *Dasein* is "*being* (*Sein*) *there* (*da*)." The sense Heidegger gave this term, explained in the passage of the regular text to which the reference mark for this note was affixed, is in sharp contrast with the meaning Kant gave it. Heidegger writes (1996, p. 189, original German edition p. 203):

"First we must explicitly note that Kant uses the term 'existence' (*Dasein*) to designate the kind of being which we have called 'objective presence' in our present inquiry. 'Consciousness of my existence' means for Kant consciousness of my objective presence in the sense of Descartes. The term 'existence' means both the objective presence of consciousness and the objective presence of things."

[143] For a discussion of the analog character of primary process (mainly associated to the computations of the right brain hemisphere) and of the digital character of secondary process (mainly associated to the computations of the left brain hemisphere), as well as of the relationship between both processes, see Chapter VII in Part II of this book, and Chapter IX, corresponding to Part III of this book. Cf. also Capriles (1994a and work in progress 2 [in both books, chapter "La inversión hegeliana de la evolución y de la historia"), as well as Capriles (1992).

[144] In 2000, I read that experiments showed that, thought the left hemisphere functions mainly in digital terms and the right hemisphere functions mainly in analog terms, in case of need the left hemisphere can carry out analog functions and the right hemisphere can perform digital functions. Unfortunately, at the time I failed to copy the reference for this information, and subsequently I have been unable to track it down. I will keep looking for the source so as to mention it in subsequent editions of this book. In the meantime, I copy the following Wikipedia entry (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cerebral_hemispheres):

"Popular psychology has suggested that the right brain is responsible for creativity and emotion, and the left brain is responsible for logic, analysis, and spatial reasoning. However, these are broad generalizations with little support. Both hemispheres process the same data. The difference is that the left brain processes in a linear, or sequential manner. The right brain processes data simultaneously, and because it is mute, does not connect plausible explanations immediately to each step in the process, but instead trusts the left brain to later link the reasoning behind beliefs or decisions.

"The best evidence of lateralization for one specific ability is language. Both of the major areas involved in language skills, Broca's area and Wernicke's area, are in the left hemisphere. Perceptual information from the eyes, ears, and rest of the body is sent to the opposite hemisphere, and motor information sent out to the body also comes from the opposite hemisphere (see also primary sensory areas).

"*If these specific pieces of the brain are injured or destroyed, their functions can sometimes be recovered by neighboring brain regions — even opposite hemispheres. This depends more on the age and the damage occurred than anything else*. (Italics my own.)

"The magnocellular pathway of the visual system sends more information to the right hemisphere, while the parvocellular pathway sends more information to the left hemisphere. There are higher levels of the neurotransmitter norepinephrine on the right and higher levels of dopamine on the left. There is more white-matter (longer axons) on right and more grey-matter (cell bodies) on the left (Carter, 2004).

"Studying the brain has shown that simplistic pseudoscience claims about brain function tend to miss or skew vital information. It is important to stress that there is much about the brain that is not understood by scientists, but it is clear at this point that processes like creativity, emotion, spatial reasoning, and logical reasoning involve regions spread across the brain.

"Researchers neuropsychologists like Roger Sperry have studied split-brain patients to better understand lateralization. Sperry has also used tachistoscopes to present visual information to one hemisphere or the other. Scientists have also studied people born without a corpus callosum to determine specialization of brain hemispheres."

For further information cf. the Wikipedia entry on Lateralization of brain function (available at the URL: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lateralization_of_brain_function).

[145] The negation of being is sustained and made to wrongly appear as absolutely true and ultimately important precisely by the phenomenon that it negates, and as such it is secondary with regard to this phenomenon and subordinate to it. Nevertheless, the intuition of nonbeing—consisting in the realization that the being of essents does not lie in the essents themselves, but is put by basic human delusion, and is itself an

illusion—allows us to glimpse the true mode of existence of being and, in this sense, is less deceitful than being itself. This realization—which may be explained as the "presence of the absence of the being of essents" (or as the "presence of the absence of the mode of existence that we had wrongly projected on essents," etc.)—may take place in certain meditation practices, in "psychotic derealization," etc.

[146] It must be noted that the Chinese term *k'ung* and the Japanese term *ku* translate the Sanskrit term *shunyata* (rather than the more specific *swabhava shunyata*) and the Tibetan term tongpanyi.

[147] The two schools that make up this type of Madhyamaka are the Madhyamaka Zhentongpa School and the Mahamadhyamaka (Tib. Uma Chenmo [*dbu ma chen mo*]) School. Both of them categorize the true nature of reality as empty in the zhentong (*gzhan stong*) sense insofar as there is nothing other than this nature, and categorize phenomena as empty in the rangtong sense insofar as they all lack self-being: the true nature of reality is empty in the zhentong (*gzhan stong*) sense because phenomena are empty in the rangtong (*rang stong*) sense, and phenomena are void in the rangtong sense because the true nature of reality is void in the zhentong sense and because they depend on other phenomena. Emptiness in the zhentong sense (zhengyi ngöpo tongpanyi [*gzhan gyi dngos po stong pa nyid*]; Skt. *paravastushunyata*?) or "absence of substances other than the single true condition of all reality" has its roots in canonical sources of both the Second and the Third Promulgations, as well as in works by the founding fathers of Madhyamaka and in works by the some of the main interpreters of the sutras of the Third Promulgation. For an explanation of these schools and their precise views, cf. the upcoming definitive version in print of Capriles (2004). (The term Madhyamaka is Sanskrit, whereas the term Zhentongpa [*gzhan stong pa*] is Tibetan. Since Madhyamaka is rendered into Tibetan as Uma (*dbu ma*), the correct term is Uma Zhentongpa [*dbu ma gzhan stong pa*]. However, since I am using the Sanskrit term to refer to this school, for it is the one that is best known by Westerners, I had to incur in the widely accepted oddity of combining a Sanskrit term with a Tibetan one.)

[148] I say "might" because it is clear that not in all cases does the tense of the verbal form determine whether the grammatical subject has being *qua* actuality or lacks being *qua* actuality. In fact, whereas sentences such as "X will be there tomorrow" or "X was there yesterday" do not tell us that X is not there today, "X died" tells us X no longer has being *qua* actuality, and "X will die tomorrow" tells us X still has being *qua* actuality.

[149] See the preceding note.

[150] The doctrine according to which being *qua* absolute position or self-being must be refuted and being *qua* actuality must be conserved, which was elaborated by Je Tsongkhapa, was refuted in Gendün Chöphel (2005), where it was shown that it was impossible to maintain being *qua* actuality while doing away with the illusion of self-being, and that a practice that attempts to do so will sustain *samsara*. In the discussion of the problem in the regular text of this chapter of the present book, and in a prior note to this chapter, this refutation was made quite clear.

[151] The phenomenon that is the core of our being is the being of the mental subject; however, we do not always experience ourselves solely as the mental subject. For example, if at some point some part of our body becomes paralyzed and we try to move it, we feel we are the mental subject that is trying to move the body and that the body is the object we are trying to move: at the time we are the mental subject and we are not the body. However, when we see our body's reflection in a mirror we feel we are the body. If we try to achieve a state without thought we may feel we are the mental subject who is trying to stop the flow of thoughts, and that the thoughts are the objects we are trying to stop: at the time we are the mental subject and we are not the thoughts. However, the mental subject is also a thought and thus what in fact is happening is that we are having the impression that we are one thought but not another. Furthermore, when I think my own name, or when I imagine the entity that goes by my name, I feel I am this thought. And so on and on. Therefore, there can be no doubt that what is designated by our name is not a single phenomenon, but a combination of phenomena—which, furthermore, are not always the same. (In this regard, cf. Capriles [1986].)

Concerning the lack of continuity of the essent we feel we are, it is also useful to consider the food we eat, the water we drink and the air we breath: before we assimilate them, we experience them as being external to and other with regard to ourselves, but when we have assimilated them they have become part of what we experience as ourselves. And so on and on.

[152] A partial panoramification of the focus of the conscious attention causes the limits of this focus to become more permeable, whereas a total panoramification of this focus amounts to its disappearance in a total awareness beyond center or periphery, subject or object, figure and ground. The partial panoramification

in question will impair our capacity to experience essents as being inherently separate (i.e. as involving self-being), whereas the total panoramification will simply put at end to the illusion of there being entities and hence to the illusion of self-being of entities.

[153] As noted in the discussion of the Three Phrases of Garab Dorje's testament in the first chapter of this book and I the notes to it, the first times the phenomenon of being dissolves, it will be very unlikely for us to develop an unshakable certainly concerning the fact that the *phenomenon of being* is a delusion and that the true condition of reality is what manifested when the *phenomenon of being* dissolved: this certainty develops gradually as a result of the repetition of the dissolution of the *phenomenon of being* and of the concomitant unconcealment of the true condition of reality.

As also noted in the discussion and notes in question, this is so because when the *phenomenon of being* dissolves, memory does not intervene in experience, and when memory is reestablished it is impossible to remember precisely a condition that was beyond memory. Likewise, when the *phenomenon of being* dissolves we are in a condition of total space-time-awareness, and so when the state of small space-time-knowledge that involves the separation of subject and object, and of figure and ground, manifests again, we cannot conceive the total condition that had previously unconcealed itself for the same reason a frog at the bottom of a deep well cannot imagine or conceive the sky: its limitless character is incompatible with the frog-in-the-well-like character of our fragmentary, claustrophobic experience.

[154] The term *pan*ic derives from the Greek *pan*, meaning totality, and refers to the experience of "irrational dread in the face of glimpses of the continuum of totality and of the insubstantiality of essents implied by the fact that totality is a continuum." This is why in Greek mythology the god Pan (an embodiment of nature *qua* totality represented as having the legs, horns and fur of a he-goat), who roamed through caves and solitudes, amused himself by inducing terror (i.e. *pan*ic) on the travelers who crossed through forests and mountains. The cult of Pan was reputedly born in the Arcadia Mountains in the Peloponnesus, but it rapidly extended itself through the whole of ancient Greece. Later on, it became associated to those of Dionysus (who was also associated to horns and horned animals) and the nymphs—at which point Pan was said to be Dionysus' favorite. Just as in the case of the cult of Dionysus, in the cult of Pan wine and meat were ritually employed. We could supplement the traditional myth by adding that Pan was exiled to the wildernesses as soon as humankind became urbane and "civilized."

During the reign of Tiberius, the death of Pan was announced to a pilot called Tammuz, who brought the news to Rome, where the Christians were happy because they thought this announced the end of the old religion. Jules Michelet (1987) wrote:

"Some authors claim that, a short time before the victory of Christianity, through the shores of the Aegean Sea ran a mysterious voice saying 'the great Pan has died'.

"The ancient universal god of Nature had ceased to exist, which gave rise to great joy, for it was believed that, since Nature had died, temptation had died. Finally the human soul, lashed by tempest for so long, was going to rest.

"Was it the end of the ancient cult, its defeat, the eclipse of the ancient religious formulæ? Not at all. We may verify in each line of the first Christian monuments the hope that Nature would disappear, that life would come to an end, that the end of the world would be near...

"...The first Christians, together and individually, in the past and in the future, curse Nature. They curse it as a whole, to the extreme of seeing in a flower the incarnation of evil or of the demon (Conf. of Saint Cyprian, ap. Muratori, Script it. I, 293, 545. A. Maury. *Magic*, 435). Let there come, as soon as possible, the angels that ruined the cities of the Dead Sea, and fold up the vain face of the Earth in a sail, so that to the saint all the temptations of the world may perish.

"If the Gospel says 'the day is nigh', the Fathers say 'already upon us'."

In their turn, the technologists seem to say: "let us make it come sooner." Today, we know that the Christian churches produced great saints who fused with nature and whose spirituality was life-affirming; however, there is a considerable measure of truth in the words of the famous French historian.

[155] The path of preparation or path of application (Skt. *prayogamarga*; Tib. jorlam [Tib. *sbyor-lam*]) is the second of the five paths of the gradual Mahayana.

[156] The term semdzin (*sems 'dzin*) means "fixing the mind" and refers to methods which are used for inducing in the practitioner illusory experiences or nyam (*nyams*) which may serve as a basis for possibly discovering the state of rigpa in what the Dzogchen teachings call *direct introduction*—and, once the state of rigpa has been "discovered," for making it clearer and dispelling all doubts as to whether the true nature of reality is the one that manifested in direct introduction of the one that arose subsequently in the

post-Contemplation state. Once the state in question has been discovered and all doubts have been dispelled, the practitioner may dedicate him or herself to the main practice of Dzogchen.

It is most important to note that the experiences or nyam induced by the practice of semdzin *are not* the state of rigpa. If we compare our experiences with reflections and primordial Gnitiveness with a mirror, such experiences are like reflections in the mirror—even though they may be very different from the images which that "mirror" reflects in our daily life and more impressive than the latter. In fact, the images which present themselves as a result of the practice of semdzin may be "images" of (1) absence of thought, seemingly undivided awareness, nothingness or emptiness; (2) bliss or pleasure, and (3) clarity or radiance. However, no matter their kind, they are only images.

The state of rigpa or Awake awareness, on the other hand, is the "unveiling" of what in the simile is represented by the mirror in which all images are reflected—including *both* our usual daily life images, *and* the images obtained as a result of applying practices such as the semdzin. This is not a glimpse *by* anyone, for the mental subject has disappeared, and occurs due to the power of the true teacher, which is our own Gnitiveness, and of the external root Master.

[157] In the case of the *Bhavanakramas*, as understood by the lower form of Madhyamaka-Swatantrika-Yogachara; in the case of the Lamrim works, allegedly as viewed by Madhyamaka-Prasangika.

According to Je Tsongkhapa, in analysis with reference to the ultimate, we must try to determine whether or not an object exists in the way in which it appears to exist to the ordinary deluded mind: in terms of what Chandrakirti called "inherent existence" (Tib. rangzhin [*rang bzhin*]) or "true existence" (Tib. denpar yöpa [*bden par yod pa*]). As stated in a previous note, Gendün Chöphel (2005) objected that it was impossible to carry out the analysis in Tsongkhapa's terms, for it was only possible to do so if one had the capacity to distinguish between "mere existence" (Tib. yöpa tsam [*yod pa tsam*]) and what Chandrakirti called "inherent existence" or "true existence," but this capacity was lacking in those who had not yet attained the third bodhisattva path and therefore, not having realized the absence of what Chandrakirti called "inherent existence," were unable to identify what was to be denied. And since in order to proceed to Buddhahood al some point they will have to attain the third path, Tsongkhapa's method would seem to block the Way to the final Fruit of the Mahayana. Gelugpas claim this is not so because in Tsongkhapa's *Lamrim* works we are told exactly how to carry out the analysis, and they assert that if we follow these instructions and the analysis is fruitful, at its term the object's emptiness as understood by Tsongkhapa will manifest. However, as stated in the aforementioned previous note, even if this voidness appeared, insofar as what I call delusory valuation-absolutization, or what is called grasping (Skt. *graha*; Tib. *'dzin pa*), has not been disconnected, it will appear as self-existent (in Tsongkhapa's language, as "inherently existent"), and so a relative perception involving the delusion of self-existence (or "inherent existence") would be taken for ultimate truth: it is this that might block the way to Buddhahood.

[158] The instructions in the *Bhavanakramas*, belonging to the lower form of Madhyamaka-Swatantrika-Yogachara, were designed in order to give rise to the manifestation as object of the voidness that this sub-school posits as the ultimate truth, whereas those applied by the original Prasangikas were not conceived for giving rise to the manifestation of a conceptual voidness as an object to the mind (which, as I show in Capriles (2005), is how voidness might appear by applying Tsongkhapa's method, and how Tsongkhapa *says it must manifest*), but to "pull the conceptual carpet under the mind's feet," so that all conceptuality be done away with, including the appearance of a conceptual voidness as object, and the subject-object duality itself—and so there may be a possibility of realizing the genuine absolute truth, which is not produced / conditioned, which is not conceptual, and which is beyond the subject-object duality: this is why the true Prasangikas were called "thoroughly non-abiding Madhyamikas" (Skt. *sarvadharmapratisthanavadin*; Tib. *rab tu mi gnas par smra ba*)—a label and approach that Tsongkhapa rejected.

My usage of a psychiatric term in this context is not a mere coincidence. In fact, in Capriles (2005), I contend that it was in order to make voidness palatable to the shravakas, who dread voidness and therefore would not be willing to undergo this derealization (and who, in case they underwent it, would react psychotically to it), that Tsongkhapa taught the method of the *Bhavanakramas* as though it were the method of the original Prasangikas (which is the one leading to the realization of the true voidness of "thoroughly nonabiding Madhyamikas").

[159] I believe the *kung-an* (Jap. *koan*) method of Ch'an or Zen Buddhism to have been one of the methods of the original Madhyamaka and of Prasangika Madhyamaka—as suggested by the fact that, according to

the *Sutra of Hui Neng* (Wong-Mou-Lam [trans. 1969]) both Nagarjuna and his disciple Aryadeva (which the Sutra calls Kanadeva) were important links in the transmission of Ch'an or Zen—or to have the same function as these methods. The method in question initially gives rise to a powerful, relatively long-lasting derealization in which one experiences what is called the "mass of doubt." Then one is ready for *wu* (Jap. *satori*), which takes place spontaneously, possibly in connection to the therapeutic tricks and spontaneous reactions of the Ch'an Master, and which may be relatively long lasting (there are reports of *wu* or *satori* lasting hours and even days).

160 The question implied here is whether or not the mere application of analysis intended to result in the manifestation of voidness as object may induce a thorough derealization, or whether the increase of energetic-volume-determining-the-scope-of-awareness (Skt. *kundalini*; Tib. *thig le*) and the resulting panoramic and more permeable focus of conscious attention is necessary for a thorough derealization to occur. Tantric Madhyamaka insists that the increase in question is necessary.

161 As stated in a previous note, "higher bodhisattvas" (Skt. *arya bodhisattva*; Tib. pagpa [*'phags pa*]) are those traveling the third and fourth of the five paths (Skt. *marga*; Tib. *lam*) of the gradual Mahayana, or, which is the same, those ranging between the first and the tenth level (Skt. *bhumi*; Tib. *sa*).

162 The fact that this is not absolute may be illustrated with two different Tibetan stories.

The first is that of the Tibetan practitioner of Chö (*gcod*) who was haunted by a dreadful demon, and no matter how hard he tried, he failed to dissolve it. His teacher told him to draw a cross in the demon's belly and then stick his sharpened *purbhu* knife in the middle of the cross—warning him to check where he was to stick the *purbhu* before so doing. When the demon appeared he drew the cross and, when he was about to stick the *purbhu* in it, he remembered his teacher's warning that he should check exactly where he was to stick it. When he did so, he realized that the cross was drawn on his own belly—upon which the demon disappeared and never disturbed him again.

The second is far more challenging to both common sense and science: another practitioner of Chö (*gcod*) was attacked by robbers, who severed his head. Thinking that the robbers and the falling of his own head were visions, he took his head, put it on again, and kept on with his practice—which caused the robbers to run away in terror. When the practitioner's son arrived in the morning to bring some yoghurt to his father, he saw all the blood and asked the latter what had happened. When the practitioner realized that his head had been cut in "real life," the head fell off and he died on the spot.

163 It was Baumgarten who introduced the modern sense of the term "aesthetics"—which Kant did not employ in his *Critique of Pure Reason* (*Kritik der reinen Vernunft*), but which he used throughout his *Critique of* [*the Faculty of*] *Judgment* (*Kritik der Urteilskraft*).

164 The thesis of Medieval ontology, which goes back to Aristotle, is that "to the being of an essent belongs being a 'what' (*Wassein*, *essentia*) and being an 'available essent' (*Vorhandensein*, *existentia*)." It is the former that the ontology in question—that had its continuity in Baumgarten and Kant—called "reality."

165 However, it must be borne in mind that, as we have seen, Heidegger never claimed that being constituted an error or a delusion, but posited it as truth (*aletheia*) itself.

166 "Falling prey" in Heidegger's sense; not in the Biblical sense of "the Fall," which will be employed in the last chapter of this book.

167 A precondition for being to take on the character of "reality" in Heidegger's sense of the term is that what the Dzogchen teachings refer to as tsel (*rtsal*) energy should be manifest. The aspects of the Base and the modes of manifestation of energy were explained in the first chapter of this book; a more in-depth explanation was given in Capriles (2003) (the definitive, corrected version of which will soon be available in print), and an even more in-depth explanation will appear in Volume Two of my *Buddhism and Dzogchen*.

168 As the reader surely knows, the word "reality" derives from the Latin *res-rei*, meaning "thing."

169 Although this was the sense of the term "reality" that prevailed in twentieth century philosophy, not all authors used it in this sense. To mention just one example: in *Möglichkeit und Wirlichkeit* (1938), Nicolai Hartmann used manifold arguments to prove "actuality" *not* to be a synonym of "reality."

170 Thus the *Dasein* is the being of the twentieth century human being, of modern human beings, or at most of human beings of the last millennia, but not the being of human beings of all times. In general the whole of *Existenzphilosophie* and existentialism applies to human beings having a *Dasein* and hence belonging to what could be called "the time of the *Dasein*," but not to human beings of all ages.

171 I will not discuss imagination at depth in this book; suffice to say that I subscribe to a great deal of Sartre (1950, 1940).

[172] If I hallucinate a stone and want to throw it at someone else's head, when I try to pick up the stone in order to throw it, it is likely that the stone will disappear. However, if I had the illusion of throwing it, and I did not throw another material object mistakenly believing it to be the stone, he or she would not be at all affected by the stone I threw.

However, in the case of someone hallucinating a ghost, demon or the like throwing a stone at him or her, this might have effects. In this regard, cf. the examples of the practitioners of Chö (*gcod*) provided in a previous note.

[173] The Kyoto school is not a homogeneous form of thought; in the first place, what is so called is Nishida Kitaro's (1870-1945) thinking, though also Tanabe Hajime (1885-1962) is included in it. In fact, in spite of the fact that Tanabe's thought is clearly different from Nishida's, some speak of a "Nishida-Tanabe" school. Other philosophers classified within the Kyoto School are Koyama Iwo, Kosaka Masaaki, Temonaga Sanjuro, Shuzo Kuki (1888-1941), the Rinzai Zen monk Howeki Shin'ichi Hisamatsu (1889-1962), Tetsuro Watsuji (1889-1960), Kiyoshi Miki (1897-1945) and Keiji Nishitani (1900-1990). Younger representatives of the school are Yoshinori Takeuchi (1913-2002), Masao Abe (1915), Koichi Tsujimura (1922), Eiho Kawahara (1921), Yoshio Kayano (1925), Shizuteru Ueda (1926) and Jiro Watanabe (1932).

Several members of this school were students and practitioners of Zen Buddhism, which to a greater of lesser extent determined their thought in interaction with influences received from Western philosophies. Among the latter, in some members of the Kyoto School the influence of Neokantism prevailed; in others Husserl's influence was most determinant, and in still others those from Heidegger and existentialism were crucial. In particular, as seen throughout this chapter and as acknowledged in various works (cf. the immediately following note), Heidegger has had a considerable influence in Japan, mainly because some have wrongly seen in the German philosopher's thought a Westernized conceptual expression of Zen Buddhism.

Nishida Kitaro tried to synthesize, in his own way, Mahayana Buddhist philosophies in general and Zen Buddhism in particular, with Western philosophy and especially with some aspects of German idealism and the thinking of Bergson. Tanabe Hajime received direct influences from Nishida Kitaro, but also, during his studies in Germany, from Neokantism of the Marburg school, Husserl and Heidegger—and, later on, from Hegel, which he oddly related to Zen thought, giving rise to what he called "an absolute dialectic."

On the general philosophy of the Kyoto school the reader may consult to following works: Heisig (2001); Löwith, Yoshioka & Vianello (1995); Ohashi (Ed. 1990; 1986); and the Internet URL: www.nanzan-u.ac.jp/SHUBUNKEN. Concerning the accusations of fascism made against the Kyoto School and its members, cf. Parkes (1997), who attempts to defend them from these accusations.

[174] In the regular References I list in this regard three works that provide most relevant historic facts and bibliographic sources: (1) Saviani (2004); (2) May (1996); and (3) Buchner (Ed. 1989). Besides, I list works that, while not being specially devoted to the relationship between Heidegger and Eastern thought, contain chapters dealing with it.

Then, in a special section of the References, I list all the relevant works dealing specifically with Heidegger's eastern sources, influences and contacts, which I have come to know about through the sources I have directly studied. Though I have not been able to obtain or study most of the works quoted in this special section of the bibliography, I hope to be able to obtain and study them at some point.

[175] With the publication of Buchner (Ed. 1989), the town of Meßkirch, where Heidegger was born, celebrated his centenary. In 1985, Meßkirch was twinned with the Japanese town of Unoke, where Kitaro Nishida was born. Cf. the volume Stadt Meßkirch (Ed. 1985); in particular, cf. the contribution by H. Rombach (pp. 23-48), Völkerbegegnung im Zeichen der Philosophie. Cited in Saviani (2004), p. 18, n. 5.

[176] At the time of Chuang-tzu the concept of "rationalism" was far from arising. Paul Shih-yi Hsiao seems to understand the term as referring to those doctrines that attach supreme value to secondary-process logic.

[177] The full excerpt reads: "A German friend of Heidegger told me that one day when he went to visit Heidegger at home he found him reading one of Suzuki's books. 'If I understand this man correctly', Heidegger observed, 'this is what I have always tried to say in all of my writings'."

[178] The book *Buddhism*: *A Religion without God* has been long available in Spanish; since 1996, it is also available in Italian. In English, at least two book by Hisamatsu are available: *Critical Sermons of the Zen Tradition*: *Hisamatsu's Talks on Linji*, and *Zen and the Fine Arts*.

[179] Another dialogue between Heidegger and Hisamatsu, this time a private one, was recorded by a disciple of the latter and published in Japan (reproduced as Wechselseitige Spiegelung, in Buchner [Ed. 1989], pp. 189-192. Cited in Saviani [2004], pp. 73-74).

[180] The philosophy of *Being and Time* may perhaps be classified within *Existenzphilosophie*, but the same does not apply to the philosophy Heidegger developed after the beginning of the *Kehre* or "turnabout," which pretends to be a pure phenomenological ontology and which looks down on the preoccupations of *Existenzphilosophie* and Existentialism.

[181] This is what in Italy Mussolini (possibly with Nietzsche's words in mind) called "to live dangerously."

[182] In the work *Herakleitos und Zoroaster,* August Gladisch (1859) intended to substantiate an alleged genetic link between Heraclitus' philosophy and Zoroastrian religion. Though Gladisch's four works attempting to prove the influence of Eastern thinking on Greek philosophy (Gladisch [1859, 1858, 1864, 1866]) are no longer given any credit (cf. Cappelletti [1972b]), the similitude and parallelisms between Heraclitus' philosophy and some of the nondual wisdom traditions of Asia are so evident as to suggest a genetic link between them. However, my published paper on the subject (Capriles [2000d]) is obsolete, for it failed to consider a great deal of relevant information that I intend to ponder in Capriles (work in progress 3).

Concerning the alleged relationship between Heraclitus and the Persians, there is evidence showing that Ephesus was besieged by Darius' armies during Heraclitus' lifetime, and although the letters the former and the latter are supposed to have exchanged are nowadays deemed apocryphal, I would not discard the possibility that whoever forged them was intending to substantiate a real link between Heraclitus and Persia. However, if there was such link, it was certainly not between Heraclitus and Zarathustra or his followers, for Zoroastrism is miles apart from the Ephesian's way of thinking, but between Heraclitus and unreformed Zurvanism. To begin with, in Persia Zurvanism represented the pan-Eurasian wisdom tradition that the Dionysian mysteries represented in Greece—with which, contradicting quite a few historians of philosophy (cf. the immediately following note), I have linked Heraclitus. The point is that, as shown in Daniélou (1992), the Dionysian tradition was one and the same as the Shaiva tradition of India and as the cult of Osiris in Egypt—and the Shaiva tradition situates the home of its deity, Shiva, in Mount Kailash, which was a hub for Zurvanism and Bön (the ancient religion of Zhang-zhung and the Himalayan region), and, as will be shown below, seemingly for Taoism and other later traditions as well.

For example, upon considering the origins of Bönpo Dzogchen, the Italian scholar Giuseppe Tucci (1980), after noting that Mount Kailash was the most sacred place for Bönpo Dzogchen and Shaivism, asserted that it was a hub for Zurvanism as well. An identity between Shiva and Zurvan is suggested by the fact that the Mahakala aspect of Shiva, as reflected by the name's etymology, is the embodiment of total (*maha*) time (*kala*), just as Zurvan is the embodiment of infinite space and time (as the Syrian-born, late Greek philosopher Damascius [453-*circa* 533 CE] tells us on the basis of a text by Eudemus of Rhodes). Likewise, the Ardhanarishwara ("the Lord who is both male and female") aspect of Shiva was hermaphrodite—just as we are told was the case with Zurvan (in the *Bundahishn* I, Ormuz is presented as a bisexual god; however, scholars on Persian religion tell us that in the new forms of the religion of the magi—to which the *Bundahishn* belongs—Ormuz took the place of the Zurvan of the old religion, and that originally it was the latter who was hermaphrodite [*British Encyclopaedia*]). However, overlooking the fact that civilization has little to do with Awakening, under the influence of biased mainstream Tibetan Buddhist views, which ascribe an Indian origin to all that is valuable in Tibet, and of the generalized view of Tibet as a barbarian country and of its neighbors on the South, the North-East and the West as ancient, refined civilizations, Tucci interpreted the presence of Shaivas in the area of Mount Kailash, the terminological coincidences between Shaivism and Bönpo Dzogchen, and other evidence of exchanges between these traditions, as proving that Bönpo Dzogchen derived from Shaivism. This error was amended later on by Chögyal Namkhai Norbu (1997, 2004, unpublished ms.), who, basing himself on the evidence found in very ancient Bönpo texts, showed influences between Bönpo Dzogchen and Shaivism to have run in the opposite direction. In Namkhai Norbu (unpublished ms.) we read:

"...the chief sacred place of Shaivism is Mount Kailash in West Tibet, located in what at the time of the arising of Bönpo Dzogchen was the Kingdom of Zhang-zhung, where the Bön tradition prevailed, and where it was conserved and transmitted until its posterior diffusion through Eastern Tibet and Bhutan. Everyone automatically assumes that the culture, religion and philosophy of India and China are very old and autochthonous. However, the very opposite occurs with the culture, religion and philosophy of Tibet: people tend to assume that they must have in their integrity come from other countries, such as India, China, or even Persia. This way of thinking is typical of those who are totally conditioned by the

traditions established by pro-Indian Buddhists in Tibet. If many concepts of Dzogchen and Bön came from Shaivism, where did Shaivism come from? Since it is supposed to be of Indian origin, Shaivism could not have come from elsewhere but India, whereas Bön and Dzogchen, being Tibetan, must be something absorbed or imported from other regions and traditions.

"What a naïve way of thinking! The Shaivas conserve the whole history of their teachings, and according to it, their doctrine originated in Mount Kailash. This is the reason why every year hundreds of Shaivas go on pilgrimage from India to Mount Kailash and circumambulate it. Now, where is Mount Kailash? In India or in Tibet? And if Kailash is in Tibet and it was there that Shaivism originated, why should it be said that Bön and Dzogchen took their concepts from India? It is logical to hypothesize that Shaivism may have had its roots in Bön, which prevailed in the region of Mount Kailash ever since Tönpa Shenrab Miwoche (*ston pa gshen rab mi bo che*) established it there some 3.800 years ago, and which contains its own Dzogchen teachings, part of which may have leaked into Shaivism."

In fact, Mount Kailash has been sacred to the Bön tradition since most ancient times—*at least* since, in the area of Mount Kailash, lake Manasarovar and the city of Khyung Lung, around 1800 BCE, Primordial Revealer Shenrab Miwoche taught the original tradition of Bönpo Dzogchen called the Dzogchen Zhang Zhung Nyengyü (*rdzogs chen zhang zhung snyan brgyud*). (1800 BCE is the date Chögyal Namkhai Norbu [1996, 1997, 2004] privileges, but a different tradition gives us 16,000 BCE, and there are other interpretations as well.) As extant Bön sources tell us, *Shenrab Miwoche had disciples from China, India, Persia and neighboring regions, who became accomplished sages and then diffused Shenrab's Dzogchen teachings in their respective countries*. This might explain the connections between traditions discussed above, making it clear that rather than having derived from Shaivism, Zurvanism and/or Taoism (at any rate, a coherent system like Dzogchen could not be a mixture of three different traditions), the Dzogchen of the Bönpos was the source of the supreme teachings of Shaivism, Taoism and Zurvanism—and, as will be shown below, later on of those of Ismaili Muslims and, indirectly, of various Sufi traditions. In Namkhai Norbu (2004), pp. 28-29 (which I slightly modified on the basis of the Italian: Namkhai Norbu [1997], pp. 26-27) we read:

"Shenrab Miwoche was born in Zhang-zhung, and was therefore a Tibetan, or better a Zhang-zhung-pa, though the Bön that he taught soon spread far beyond Zhang-zhung, to countries like Tazig (Persia or Tadzhikstan), India and China. Some credible Bön sources report that the great sages Mutsa Trahe of Tazig, Hulu Baleg of Sumba, Lhadag Nagdro of India, Legtang Mangpo from China, and Serthog Chejam of Khrom translated into their respective languages and spread in their native lands the teachings of Shenrab included in the four series (or four gates) of "divine Bön" (lha bön go zhi [*lha bon sgo bzhi*])—the Shen of the Cha (Cha shen [*phywa gshen*]), the Shen of the Universe of Phenomena (Nang shen [*snang gshen*]), the Shen of Existence (Si shen [*srid gshen*]) and the Shen of Magic Power (Tul shen [*'phrul gshen*])—and in the three series known as the Divine Bön of Ritual Offerings (Shökyi lhabön [*bshos kyi lha bon*]), the Bön of Village Funeral Rites (Dronggi durbön [*grong gi 'dur bon*]) and the Bön of Perfect Mind (Yangdagpai sembön [*yang dag pa'i sems bon*])…

"[It is] certain… that the Bön of Perfect Mind (Yangdagpai sembön) taught by Shenrab Miwoche was an archaic form of Dzogchen: in fact, we possess the list and the histories of all lineage Masters of Dzogchen of the Oral Transmission of Zhang-zhung (Zhang-zhung nyengyü [*zhang zhung snyan brgyud*]). If Shenrab Miwoche taught Dzogchen, which is also the final aim of all the teachings transmitted by Buddha Shakyamuni, we cannot doubt his extraordinary qualities; we can, moreover, deduce that Tibet in that period had not only a culture, but also an exceptional form of spiritual knowledge."

The above suggests that Shaivism originated from the teachings of Shenrab's Indian disciple, Lhadag Nagdro (according to some Shaiva teachings, Shiva was a sage in human form who actually lived on earth; is it possible that the name "Shiva" be a corruption of the name Shenrab?), that Zurvanism originated from the teachings of Shenrab's disciple from Tazig, Mutsa Trahe, and that Taoism originated from the teachings of Shenrab's Chinese disciple, Legtang Mangpo (these names are in Tibetan; however, there seems to be no point in trying to find out what are their equivalents in the respective languages of these three sages). A fact that suggests that there may be a relationship between Taoism and the Himalayan Bönpo tradition is that, after giving the *Tao-Te-King* to a Chinese border officer, Lao-tzu left China in the direction of Zhang-zhung. More significant, however, is the fact that, according to William Rockhill (1997, pp. 217-218, n. 2), Bönpos in Eastern Tibet were usually identified by the Chinese as Taoists, and

Shenrab Miwoche (*gshen rab mi bo che*) was generally though to stand for Lao Tzu. Furthermore, Tsung-lien Shen wrote (1973, p. 37):

"Bön-Po, one form of Shamanism, is considered by some scholars to be a Tibetan copy of a later decadent phase of Chinese Taoism... However, by borrowing too freely from the abundance of Buddhism, it was not long before Bön-Po lost its own characteristics and became absorbed into its rival."

Alexandra David-Neel also pointed out the alleged relationship between Taoism and Bön (I have failed to remember the work in which she did so)—and I myself have heard oral reports about Taoist Masters who have asserted the identity of their own tradition and Tibetan Bön. However, just as in the case of Tucci's interpretation of the relationships between Bön and Shaivism, the Chinese seem to have inverted the course of the influences between these two systems—which was probable due to the fact that the Chinese have traditionally viewed the rest of humankind, and in particular their Tibetan neighbors, as uncultured barbarians (like Tucci, they seem to have been unaware of the fact that the Paths of Awakening antedate civilization, and that civilization is both a product and a catalyst of degeneration).

The most significant evidence suggesting a connection between Dzogchen and Taoism, however, is the fact that both the "holy immortal" or *Shen-hsien*'s "ascension to Heaven" in what Herrlee Creel (1970) called Hsien Taoism, and the ultimate sign of the complete realization of "Complete Reality" in Chuan Chen Taoism (Liu I-ming [1988]), are illustrated by the image of a snake shedding its old skin, which in Dzogchen traditionally illustrates the mode of death called *self-consuming like a fire*, which gives rise to the "body of light" (ökyiku [*'od kyi sku*] or öphung [*'od phung*]) and which results from the second highest realization in the practice of the *Upadeshavarga* series of teachings (obtained by those who have developed to some point the fourth vision of Thögel [*thod rgal*] or the Yangthik [*yang thig*]): in this mode of death, after the practitioner passes away, his or her physical body gradually turns into light, ceasing to be tangible, and only those aspects of the body that lack sensitivity and that are always growing toward the outside (namely nails and hair), together with the practitioner's clothes, stay behind as tangible remains—being reminiscent of the skin shed by a snake.

Allegedly since the eighth century BCE, what Creel called Hsien Taoism has been using *generative* means including visualization, recitation, retention of the seed-essence in combination with erotic relationships, alchemic drugs, breathing exercises, diet and so on, in order to prolong the human lifespan and allegedly *produce* an immortal body—a paramount contradiction, for as Buddhist doctrine makes it clear, all that is produced / caused (Pali *bhèta*; Skt. *nutpada* or *nutpatti*; Tib. kyepa [*skyes pa*]), born (Pali and Skt. *jata*; Tib. kyepa [*skyes pa*]), or compounded / conditioned / constructed / made / contrived / fabricated (Pali, *sankhata*; Skt. *samskrita*; Tib. düjai [*'dus byas*]), is impermanent, and only what is unproduced / unbecome / uncaused (Pali *abhèta*; Skt. *anutpada*, *anutpatti*; Tib. makyepa [*ma skyes pa*]), unborn (Pali and Skt. *ajata*; Tib. makyepa [*ma skyes pa*]) and unconditioned / uncompounded / unproduced / unmade / uncontrived (Pali, *asankhata*; Skt., *asamskrita*; Tib., dümaje [*'dus ma byas*]) is beyond corruption, cessation and death. This form of Taoism contested the Taoism of Lao-tzu, Chuang-tzu, Lieh-tzu and the Masters of Huainan, for not long after the time of Chuang-tzu (ca. 369-286 BCE), and probably at the time of Lieh-tzu, in his *Pao-p'u-tzu* ("He Who Holds to Simplicity," a pseudonym of the author) or *Nei P'ien*, Confucian would-be alchemist and repressor of egalitarian Taoist revolts, Ko-hung (*circa* 283-343 BCE; the term "Confucian would-be alchemist" is from Kirkland [undated]), derided Chuang-tzu for saying that death should not be resisted, referred to Chuang-tzu's way as "pure conversation" (*ch'ing t'an*)—which Alan Watts translated as "nothing but a head trip"—and wrote that Chuang-tzu (Creel [1970], I, p. 22; Watts [1975b], p. 91; a partial English translation of Ko-hung's writings appeared in 1967 in the book now available as Ware, [1981]):

"…says that life and death are just the same, brands the effort to preserve life as laborious servitude, and praises death as a rest."

He then concluded:

"...this doctrine is millions of miles apart from that of [the] *shen-hsien* (holy immortals)."

The struggle to maintain life, youth and health and avert death, old age and illness (the same struggle that almost three millennia later gave rise to the current ecological crisis) that is characteristic of what Creel called Hsien Taoism, and the fact that the reputed master of this tradition, Ko-hung, was a Confucian scholar-soldier who commanded imperial armies that quenched egalitarian Taoist revolts, evidence the fact that the founders of this brand of Taoism obeyed to the dualistic, repressive, so-called "Saharasian" ideologies that were originally introduced into China by the Shang invasion at around 2000 BCE and that turned more oppressive as an outcome of the Chou (pinyin, Zhou) invasion that occurred at around 1500

BCE (Taylor [2005], pp. 62-3; DeMeo [1998]). Hsien Taoism has allegedly been intent on prolonging the human lifespan and producing immortal bodies roughly since the eighth century BCE—two or three centuries earlier than the birth of Lao-tzu, yet some eight centuries after the Chou (Zhou) invasion. Since the avowed purposes of Hsien Taoism consisted in prolonging the human lifespan well over its natural limits and attempting the contradictory task of *producing* immortal bodies, and since a key representative of this trend such as Ko-hung derided Chuang-tzu for his acceptance of mortality, it is certain that this brand of Taoism could not have led to the realization illustrated by the image of the snake shedding its skin. Therefore we may conclude that the forgers who concocted Hsien pseudo-Taoism appropriated this exclusively Dzogchen image and some of the Tantric methods and doctrines they incorporated into their system, from the original, unadulterated Taoist tradition that gave continuity to the teachings of Shenrab Miwoche that Legtang Mangpo brought to China around one millennium before the alleged origin of Shen Taoism (and hence in the period between the Shang invasion and the Chou [Zhou] invasion) and fourteen centuries before the time of Lao-tzu (a most important link in this tradition)—reinterpreting this Dzogchen image and the Tantric methods they stole from genuine Taoism (such as the visualization of ch'i [pinyin, qi] moving around the heart described in Wilhelm [1962] and the use of sexual relationships with retention of the seed-essence—which were also part of the lore of the Bön of Shenrab Miwoche) in terms of their repressive, dualistic "Saharasian" ideology, and using them to pursue aims contrary, not only to those of Dzogchen and its continuity within Taoism of Unorigination, but to those of Tantrism as well.

The form of Taoism that, like the Dzogchen teachings, stressed the fact that the Fruit of true spiritual Paths is the realization of the uncreated, unborn, unconditioned true nature of reality, is the Taoism of Lao-tzu, Chuang-tzu, Lieh-tzu and the Masters from Huainan, which Creel (1970) subsumed under the label *Contemplative Taoism* and I subsumed under the label *Taoism of Unorigination*. However, in the extant texts of these Masters the image of the snake shedding its old skin is absent; as noted above, it is found in Hsien Taoism, which as we have seen is contrary to the aims, views and methods of Dzogchen, and which contested what Creel called Contemplative Taoism and that I called Taoism of Unorigination, and in Chuan Chen Taoism (note the phonetic similarity and partial etymological correspondence between the terms Chuan Chen and Dzogchen), which traces its roots to Lao-tzu, Chuang-tzu, Lieh-tzu and the Huainan Masters, and which, like the Taoism of these great Masters and like the Dzogchen teachings, derides generative methods and emphasizes the fact that only the realization of the uncreated, unborn true condition of all essents that Taoism calls the Tao (and that the Dzogchen teachings call Dzogchen *qua* Base) can put a definitive end to the "problem of life." In fact, Chuan Chen Taoism seems to be a set of methods for attaining this realization and making it stable and irreversible, and hence for going beyond rejection of death *and beyond death itself* (insofar as those who have fully realized their true nature to be the unborn, undying primordial condition, cannot be affected by death of the perishable), for it made it clear that in their system "becoming an immortal" did not refer to the *production* of a new *conditioned* state or condition: according to the eighteenth century commentator Liu I-ming (1988), the term referred to the unveiling of the pure and perfect primordial ("pre-natal") awareness that... "is not born and does not die." In Chuan Chen terminology, this primordial state is variously referred to as the "precious pearl," the "pre-natal mind," the "triplex unity of essence, energy, and spirit" (which, one could speculate, might correspond the Dzogchen triad consisting of essence, nature and energy) or simply the "Way" (Tao). Liu I-ming tells us that "awake or asleep, it is always there," and that the same applies to stillness and movement, which are the Yin and Yang—passive and creative, dark and light, empty and full—facets of the ever-present primordial state, comparable to waves rising and falling on the sea, or wind stirring the air. Liu I-ming describes the realization of the primordial condition as "a stateless state… tranquil and unstirring, yet sensitive and effective—call on it and it responds [with movement]; in quietude it is [perfectly] clear." Since movement is an indivisible aspect of the primordial state, in order to integrate it, Taoism has *tai chi chuan*, the eight pieces of brocade, and other moving *chi-kung* forms. For a period, the aspiring Chuan Chen adept retires from the world and goes into seclusion in the mountains in order to practice the teachings and attain spontaneous perfection—a process known as *hsiou tao* ("cultivating the Way"). Finally, when the "complete reality" of Tao has been realized, the adept "returns to the towns and markets" to apply the Way "among ordinary people" in all the myriad activities of daily life. Despite the fact that, as noted above, Chuan Chen Taoism referred to its own realized ones as *shen-hsien*, the contrast between this system and that of Ko-hung and other forgers is further evidenced by the following words by Liu I-ming: "The Tao is a treasure… having nothing to do

with material alchemy. It is utterly simple, utterly easy… It is completely spiritual, true goodness. The ridiculous thing is that foolish people seek mysterious marvels, when they do not know enough to preserve the mysterious marvel that is actually present.” (Quotes from Liu I-ming were taken from Reid [2002/2003], who in his turn took them from Liu I-ming [1988].)

Since it seems unlikely that such an odd image as a snake shedding its old skin may have been used in neighboring countries by traditions that seem to be genetically linked to illustrate different occurrences, I tend to conclude that Chuan Chen Taoism gave continuity to the ancient Taoist tradition that originated from Legtang Mangpo (the Chinese disciple of Shenrab Miwoche), of which the Taoism of Lao-tzu, Chuang-tzu, Lieh-tzu and the Masters from Huainan were expressions, and hence that the latter, just like the Dzogchen teachings, used the image of the snake shedding its skin to refer to the realization of the body of light. The fact that we have no records of their use of this image because their extant treatises may be due to the fact that they were intended to be public treatises, which should not deal with the innermost methods of this type of Taoism and their results. Furthermore, if what Chuan Chen Taoism represents with the image of the snake shedding its old skin were the attainment of the body of light, its methods would have to be based on the principle of spontaneous liberation rather than on that of Tantric transformation or on that of Sutric renunciation, which do not lead to the special modes of death. In fact, its methods would have to be based on the spontaneous perfection or lhundrub (*lhun grub*) dynamic of the human system, which is the only principle that may lead to such realization; and since the lhundrub dynamic of the human system is utterly beyond action, this dynamic must be the root of the Taoist principles of *wu-wei* (nonaction), *wei-wu-wei* (action through nonaction) or *tzu-jan* (spontaneity or “self-so”).

Finally, it seems important to note that in Islamic times Duodeciman Shi’a Islam replaced Zurvanism as the Persian expression of the ancient pan-Eurasian tradition under consideration—and, in fact, according to Tucci (1980), Mount Kailash was a place of pilgrimage for the Ismailians as well. In Sunni Islam, the function the Ismailian tradition had in Shi’a Islam was played by the Sufis. Some of these absorbed the ancient doctrines and practices of the pan-Eurasian tradition under consideration from the Buddhism of Oddiyana and neighboring regions through Sufi Master Jabbir el-Hajjam, who received the spiritual traditions of the Barmecides (Shah [1975], p. 197), who descended from the Barmakis who presided over the Buddhist temple in Balkh that was supposedly called *Nova Bihara* and miscalled “Temple of Fire” (Under the Direction of Brice Parain [1972], p. 244). At any rate, among Sufi traditions, the one that seems to have a closest connection with the old traditions linked to Mount Kailash is the Kajagan or Naqshbandi School.

Other Sufis received the traditions in question from the Ismailians. In Under the Direction of Yvon Belaval (1981), p. 120, we read: “Under the cloak (the *hirqa*) of Sufism, Ismailism survived in Iran after the destruction of [the fortress of] Alamut, and henceforth there has always been an ambiguity in the very literature of Sufism. The great poem of Mahmud al-Sabistari shows Ismaili reminiscences and there is a partial Ismaili commentary to the *Rose Garden of Mystery*. Thus, it is frequent that the Nizari literature of the tradition of Alamut carries on in the form of treatises in verse. Al-Quhistani (dead *circa* 720/1320) seems to have been the first to use Sufi terminology for expressing Ismaili doctrines...” (Following this, we are given a long list of Sufi works expressing Alamut Ismaili philosophy.) However, Ismaili doctrines seem to have entered Sufism since a much earlier time. For example, early Sufi Master Mansur el-Hallaj (858-922) reportedly belonged to Carmathian circles (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*; Sellers [1997-2003]; Wassermann [2001]), and therefore he must have received Ismailian traditions, teachings and practices. The same seems to be the case with Maulana Jalal-ud-din Rumi, whose teacher, Shams-i-Tabriz, was the grandson of a lieutenant of Ismailian chief Hassan Ibn el-Sabbah (Iqbal [1964]). (According to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Mansur al-Hallaj may have been implicated in the Carmathian-inspired Zanj rebellion that took place in present-day Kuwait, which according to the same source may have been Carmathian-inspired. The Carmathians, *de facto* founded by Hamdan Qarmat when he began preaching in 877-8 CE, upheld communist ideals and practices [Bausani, 1988], as well as an undisguised mysticism based on Communion. They endangered the Abbaside Empire, and a Carmathian chief conquered Mecca in 930 CE. Later on, they were defeated, but they retained power in Bahrain. Though the Ismaili Fatimide dynasty in Egypt did not try to implement communist doctrines, the Carmathians, whom they supported, freely worked on their behalf [Bausani, 1988].)

Finally, still other Sufis allegedly received from Egypt ancient traditions through Dhul-Nun al-Misti, founder of the order of “Builders,” which used a symbolism similar to that of modern Freemasons: according to

H. J. Witteveen (1997), he was the connecting link between Islamic Sufism and the Hermetic tradition of Hellenistic Egypt; however, it is possible that he was in possession of traditions related to Osiris, who according to Daniélou (1992) was the Egyptian equivalent of Shiva and Dionysus.

Now we can return to the problem that gave rise to this note. The first thing we may infer from all the above is that if, as I have suggested, Heraclitus was a representative of the Dionysian tradition, and if Taoism was actually connected to Mount Kailash, there may be a genetic cause for the likeness between the thought of Heraclitus and that of Lao-tzu, which has been correctly remarked by so many authors. The same applies to the likeness between the thought of Heraclitus and that of the Madhyamaka school of philosophy, for according to an important history of Buddhism Nagarjuna, founder of this school, and his immediate successor, Aryadeva, were links in the transmission of Buddhist Dzogchen (though Buddhism asserts its Dzogchen tradition to have arisen independently of that of Bön, and though research aimed at proving that the former derived from the latter has failed to do so, Tibetan Buddhism in general and Buddhist Dzogchen in particular view Mount Kailash as a specially holy place; furthermore, in later times the Bönpo Dzogchen tradition assimilated the most sophisticated teachings of Buddhist Dzogchen). In fact, in Namkhai Norbu (1988), p. 26, we read:

"Garab Dorje, the first Master of [Buddhist] Dzogchen, was the source of two lineages, one of seven disciples and one of twenty-one, and one of these twenty-one successors was Nagarjuna. Besides, it is claimed that Aryadeva vanished in light after practicing the Dzogchen teachings he received from the second Mañjushrimitra [who is considered to have been an emanation of the direct disciple of Garab Dorje bearing the same name]. All of this is clearly reported in *A Feast for the Erudite*: *A history of Buddhism* or *Chöjung Khepai Gatön* (*chos 'byung mkhas pa'i dga' ston*), by Pawo Tsuglag Threngwa (*dpa' bo gtsug lag phreng ba*: 1504-1566)."

Therefore, Madhyamaka may be an adaptation to the structure and function of the Mahayana, of the views that follow from Dzogchen realization. Furthermore, just as evident as the similitude and parallelisms between the Madhyamaka School of philosophy and Heraclitus' thought is that between the former and Greek Skepticism (though most scholars have focused on the parallelisms and possible links between the Madhyamaka School and the Skeptic school founded by Pyrrho of Elis, the similitude of the former with the skepticism of neo-Academics Carneades and Arcesilas, that of so-called "Sophists" such as Cratylus, Protagoras and Gorgias, and that of the Cynics, is equally evident). Among the works that have speculated about possible genetic links between Madhyamaka and Pyrrho, I am aware of the following: McEviley (1982); Capriles (1994); Gómez de Liaño (1998), and Carré (1999,2001). However, against the opinion of Gómez de Liaño, according to whom Madhyamaka arose out of Greek influence on Buddhism during the Hellenistic period (Pyrrho and Anaxarchus of Abdera traveled with Alexander's armies to India, and later on post-Hellenistic Afghanistan adopted the Buddhist religion), the possible genetic links in question might have resulted from the alleged relationship between Heraclitus and the ancient pan-Eurasian tradition discussed above. This may be so because, according to Greek skeptic author Aenesidemus, Skepticism is a propaedeutics to Heraclitus' philosophy (Braga [1931], cited in Cappelletti [1969]); likewise, in his renowned book *Adversus mathematicos*, the Greek skeptic Sextus reproduced the initial paragraph of Heraclitus' book.

With regard to many of the points made in this note, the reader may consult Capriles (1998a, 1998b, 1999c, 2000a, 2000b, 2003, Parts II and III of the present work, and work in progress 3). The last of the works in question is the one that will discuss them most in detail.

[183] The theory according to which Heraclitus was a Dionysian high priest contradicts the widespread view that fragments DK 15 and DK 68 of Heraclitus' book meant he was an enemy of this tradition. The truth is that the criticisms expressed in those fragments were directed against those who clung to popular, gross, outer signs of worship rather than applying the instructions for gaining direct access to the *aletheia* of the *physis*—and in fact the true Masters of all genuine Wisdom traditions have berated capable individuals who forsake the quest for Awakening, favoring the gross, outer worship their respective traditions reserve for the childish (examples of this abound in Tibetan, Indian and Chinese Buddhist traditions). Furthermore, in Fr. DK 15 Heraclitus, rather than negating the divine character of Dionysus, proclaims his identity with Hades.

The essence of the nontheistic spirituality of the primordial age was Communion in the unconcealment of the true nature of all essents, which dissolves the dualistic illusion of self and other that is the condition of possibility of relationships in general, and of vertical, oppressive, exploitative, wicked relationships in particular. Therefore, so long as this nontheistic spirituality prevailed, oppression, exploitation, discord,

war and ecological devastation could not manifest. Later on, as human delusion increased and the capacity for Communion diminished, the pan-Eurasian tradition represented in Greece by the Dionysian mysteries, and in other places by Shaivism, Zurvanism, Bön, Taoism and so on, curbed the development of the most wicked consequences of delusion. Then, when the Kurgans or Indo-Europeans, the Semites and others of the peoples that the dubious author James DeMeo (1998) called "Saharasian" forsook the spirituality of Communion for the worship of gods of war and conquest and set out to take over the rest of the world, among the countries that had as their religion one or another of the systems representing the pan-Eurasian tradition in question, those in which the local peoples were most successful in assimilating the conquerors, so that the previous local religion was allowed to prevail, managed through their religion to restrain the worst aspects of the conquerors. In our time, I deem some Tibetan Buddhist traditions—and in particular the Dzogchen system—to be the most wholesome and healthy expressions of that pan-Eurasian tradition, insofar they conserve in their integrity the ever more powerful means that, as the illusion of selfhood gained in power, arose and developed in order to continue granting access to Communion—and not only to grant access to Communion, but to undo the illusion in question so that the final goal of making Communion uninterrupted could be attained. As will be shown in Part III of this book, I also deem the system and traditions in question to have a pivotal function in the approaching restoration of primordial harmony, which has been made possible and indispensable by the completion of the *reductio ad absurdum* of delusion achieved by ecological crisis.

When a people lives in terms of vertical oppressive structures, these mould the psyche of its members, manifesting in the whole of their relationships: between itself and other peoples, humans and the rest of the ecosphere, mind and body, males and females (in which the *overtly* oppressed gender is the female, which insofar as its reproductive functions are more evident, is identified with nature, and whose more passive social role makes it the natural *visible* victim), parents and children, lords and slaves, rulers and ruled, those who got rich and those who were reduced to poverty, and so on. Since, in order to justify their wicked behavior, those who live in terms of such structures have to view as evil and worthless all that they injure, oppress and exploit—other peoples, nature, the body, females, children, slaves, the ruled, the poor, and so on—they develop anti-somatic (hostile toward the body), life-denying and dualistic religious systems which view the body and nature as evil, and which posit a soul separate from the human body that has to control and oppress the latter and the rest of nature. Steve Taylor (2005), among others (e.g. van der Dennen [1995]), has gathered and made available ample evidence suggesting that (with the exception of some occurrences beginning in 12,000 BCE in isolated spots in the Nile valley) violence was unknown before 4,000 BCE, when, as James DeMeo (1998) has asserted, together with the rest of the wayward, wicked characteristics under consideration, violence became ubiquitous among the peoples he referred to as Saharasians, which progressively came to conquer virtually the whole world, contaminating with their characteristics the peoples they dominated. (I do not accept DeMeo's ecological-geographical determinism, and see the development of the wayward, wicked characteristics under discussion as part of a process of development of ego-delusion determined by what in Part III of this book I call the *lila telos* of evolution, manifest in the structure and function of the human brain, to which a dynamic is inherent that gradually increases wayward, pain-begetting patterns. And yet undoubtedly, because of contributory circumstances, among which *may well lie* the ones adduced by DeMeo, wayward characteristics develop first in some particular peoples, which precisely due to this development set out to conquer other peoples, which then become contaminated with the wayward characteristics in question.) At any rate, the dualistic, anti-somatic, oppressive religious systems these peoples produced, justified and furthered the wicked, destructive courses of behavior under consideration—including those that gave rise to the ecological crisis that has put in jeopardy the survival of our species.

As Riane Eisler (1987) has noted, among the peoples that later on DeMeo called Saharasians and that developed the above considered wayward characteristics about 4,000 BCE, becoming marauders and then setting out to conquer other peoples, the Kurgans (later called Indo-Europeans because of the territories they conquered) and the Semites are worthy of special consideration. In fact, through colonialism the Indo-Europeans gave their language to and imposed their culture on the whole of Europe (in the case of language, except for the Basque country and the Finno-Ugrian speaking countries), America, Oceania, Persia and a great deal of India, and to a great extent on parts of Africa; also through colonialism, they deeply affected the cultures of the whole of Africa and a great deal of Asia; and, more recently, through cultural imperialism and neo-colonialism, they have imposed their culture and

economic power on virtually the whole of the world. The Semites, in their turn, after the arising of the wayward, wicked traits in the peoples DeMeo Christened "Saharasians" around 4,000 BCE, conquered a great deal of the Middle East; then, through the Christian religion (which incorporated the Old Testament and the anti-somatic structures and ideology of Hebrew religion) they imposed their mental structures and ideology on the Indo-Europeans and a sizeable proportion of the peoples that the latter dominated; finally, through Islam, they imposed their mental structures and culture, and gave their religion to, most of what originally they had originally failed to conquer of the Middle East, a great deal of Africa, Pakistan, Bangla Desh, Indonesia, the Autonomous Region of Xingjian in China, a sizeable proportion of the population of India and other Asian countries, and even parts of South-Eastern Europe.

In the holy book of the Hebrews, the *Book of Genesis* (001:028) tells believers that, after creating the first humans, Adam and Eve, "...God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." Although Jesus of Nazareth preached a religion of Communion, as made evident by the words of Michelet quoted in a note to the preceding chapter, the first Christians cursed Nature to the degree of seeing in a flower the incarnation of evil or of the demon, and of hoping that Nature would disappear, that life would come to an end, that the end of the world would be near... In its turn, Islam was a characteristically Semite religion involving few elements of Communion, which went so far as to incorporate the idea of Jihad (Holy War)—which in general was understood literally as a call for conquest. (Of course, some of the great saints of Christianity—such as Saint Francis of Assisi—understood correctly Jesus' teachings, becoming embodiments of Communion with nature, and some of the monastic orders founded by such saints also followed the spirit of Jesus' teachings and showed ecological awareness. Likewise, in Shi'a Islam, the Ismailians had a religion of Communion, and in Sunni Islam the same applied to Sufism; however, though these traditions for some time managed to create a climate of tolerance and openness, they have lost their moderating power with regard to mainstream Islam.)

Among the Indo-Europeans, some examples of dualistic oppressive religious ideologies were the Orphic mysteries in Greece, and various Hindu systems in India (though the Zoroastrian religion that in Persia replaced Zurvanism was dualistic, it cared for the ecosphere, which it insisted should not be polluted). Though Sutric Buddhism had a repressive attitude toward the body and its impulses, it broke away with the caste system and admitted women to the religious life, and was effective in giving access to spiritual liberation (so that it may be regarded as a resurgence of the ancient pan-Eurasian Paths of Awakening, partly conditioned by the Indo-European anti-somatic attitude). Shortly before the advent of Buddhism, the Jaina system also rejected the caste system and admitted women to the religious life, but despite the seemingly ecological insistence of this religion on preserving all life forms, it was essentially life denying insofar as it viewed as the paroxysm of virtue starvation with the intention of preserving the life of other creatures. Like Hinayana and Mahayana Buddhism, Jainism viewed the body as impure and dirty and had a spiteful, repressive attitude towards the it; however, I find its views and methods, unlike those of Hinayana and Mahayana Buddhism, not to be conducive to spiritual liberation. (Manichean dualism, according to which the final triumph of goodness lay in the destruction of the world, was mainly Indo-European, but absorbed Semite elements via the Christian religion, which was the religion of Mani's mother, of which he incorporated aspects. Though Augustine of Hippona refuted Manichaeism, elements of this doctrine entered Christianity through his theology, which bears the imprint of the Manichaeism he harbored until his conversion to Christianity. Other dualistic Gnostic systems also resulted from the combination of Semite and Indo-European elements.)

Orphism upheld an anti-somatic, life-denying, dualistic ideology according to which the body was evil and the soul was good, the body was the prison or the tomb of the soul, and the soul had to be purified from its contamination by the body, allowing it to free itself from the prison / rise from the tomb represented by the latter. This was supposed to be achieved by the mysteries (such as those held at Eleusis), which should purify the soul and endow it with a mystic "seal" that would be recognizable after death, so that it would be allowed to dwell with the gods rather that suffer the fate of the uninitiated and be plunged into the mud (Plato, *Phaedo* [1980], 69E), doomed to an eternity of filling sieves with water by means of other sieves (Plato, *Gorgias* [1973], 493B). The Pythagoreans followed the Orphics with regarding the soul as good and the body as evil, in categorizing the latter as the tomb of the former, and in teaching means for purifying the soul from its contamination by the body and allowing it to rise from the tomb represented by the latter. However, they replaced the mysteric initiation for the practice of mathematics,

music and so on as the basic means to purify and redeem the soul: mathematics was considered to be the basis of harmony (for musical tones depend on the mathematical measures of strings and so on, and upon being combined, they produce chords) and were held to have the power to free the individual from the influence of the corporeal (probably insofar as the mathematical is incorporeal—as in the case of a mathematical point or line—whereas the physical is corporeal), and thus restore the soul to the harmony lost as a result of its confinement to the evil body. Most significant, it were the Pythagoreans that first conceived and initially implemented the scientism that two millennia after their time materialized as the modern project that unleashed the ecological crisis that has put in jeopardy the survival of life on planet Earth.

Despite the mythological links between Orpheus and Dionysus, the Orphic and Dionysian traditions held contrary, struggling worldviews. In fact, Orpheus seemed to reject the dark Dionysus in favor of the clear god, 'Apollo and sun in the same person', whom he adored (cf. e.g. Kerényi [1998], pp. 165-166). Furthermore, there is an Orphic myth according to which it was the female Thracian bacchantes known as *bassarai* who, in one of their Dionysian orgies, tore Orpheus into pieces as he (because of his dislike of the dark Dionysus, and his anti-somatic and female-despising ideology?) refused to join their ritual and grant them his favors. At any rate, the philosophies derived from Orphism were diametrically opposed to those developed by the thinkers who expressed in philosophical terms the views of the genuine Dionysian tradition, or who received influences from it—among whom, as seen in the preceding note, I rank Heraclitus, the main Skeptic Schools, some of the Sophists and the Cynics (and, though only in what regards philosophy of history and socio-political views, the Stoics, who polemicized so much with the Skeptics). In fact, fragments DK 40, DK 129 and DK 81 of Heraclitus' book show the extent to which the Ephesian berated the dogmatic system of Pythagoras—whom he called "chief captain of cheaters" and whose learning he called "deceitful erudition and evil art." It is well known that the Skeptic philosopher Sextus Empiricus also directed his book against the Pythagoreans—which may be inferred even from its title, *Adversus mathematicos*.

Since the Pythagoreans disparaged the body, basis of the human reality, to which humans are confined so long as they are alive, their ideology doomed human beings to insurmountable conflict, while favoring the development of what Gregory Bateson (1968, 1972) called *conscious purpose against nature*. Furthermore, the Pythagorean ideology, like those of most of the dualistic, anti-somatic, oppressive religious systems reviewed above, associated the female with evil and the male with goodness—and produced a long list of contraries in which the curve, the circle, the limitless and movement were associated with evil, whereas the straight line, the square, the limited and stillness were associated to goodness. As in the case of analogous spiritual systems, the association with evil of the female—one of the two basic aspects of life, as well as the *anima* aspect and one of the two main somatic energies of male human beings—was a recipe for insurmountable conflict. Like the rest of the traditions that despised the corporeal material universe, the Pythagoreans disparaged and opposed the physiological energies that constitute the very vehicle of realization. By viewing the corporeal, apparently material world as evil, they disparaged the *wisdom* that corporeal reality is (as shown in Chapter I of this book, according to the Dzogchen teachings, the reality in question is the tsel [*rtsal*] mode of manifestation of the energy of thukje [*thugs rje*] aspect of the Base, and those teachings refer to these three aspects as three *wisdoms*). Their negative view of movement (in which a similitude with the Samkhya *darshana* of Kapila and the related Yoga *darshana* of Patañjali may be observed) was also a source of insurmountable conflict, for movement is inherent in being alive. Furthermore, Pythagorean rejection of the limitless (Greek, *apeiron*; Skt. *aditi*) amounted to rejection of the single true condition of all essents that was to be realized in the pan-Eurasian traditions of which the Dionysian mysteries were the Greek expression. Since in higher forms of Buddhism the circle, which has no corners (which represent limits, which in their turn represent concepts, for insofar as these always exclude something they establish limits), represents the absence of limitations of the *dharmakaya*, their rejection of the circle is the same as their rejection of the limitless. To conclude, as the Manichean ideology makes it evident, to view the corporeal, material reality as evil, ultimately may even be thought to justify the destruction of the world—which the Pythagorean sorcerer's apprentices set in motion by beginning to build the technological Golem that, as shown in Capriles (1994a) and in Part III this book as well, has grown beyond viability in the current ecological crisis and, unless dismantled, will destroy the fabric of human society and possibly the biological existence of our species. (To conclude, it must be noted that the

Pythagorean dualism was moral—they deemed the soul to be good and the body to be evil—but not ontological, for they are supposed to have deemed the soul to be material.)

According to Diogenes Laërtius (1972-1979, vol. 2, IX, 21), Parmenides was a disciple of Pythagorean philosopher Ameinias. Though present day scholarship has disqualified this allegation, Plato (*Sophist* [1993], 242 C-D) claimed that Parmenides was a disciple of Xenophon—who in his fr. 7 narrated an episode of the life of Pythagoras and who, together with the latter, was berated in Heraclitus' fr. DK 40. In his turn, John Burnet (1964) referred to the cosmogony of Parmenides as "a sketch of Pythagorean cosmology." Emile Bréhier (1988, vol. I, p. 68) noted that the cosmogony of Parmenides was different from that of the Ionians insofar as it incorporated theogonic myths such as those described by Hesiod (also berated by Heraclitus in fr. DK 40) and those upheld by the Orphics; insofar as it regarded Love as the first god (*Symposium* [Plato, 1995, 195C); and especially insofar as, rather than viewing the *arche* or Principle to be a single primordial constituent of reality, it asserts it to be a pair of opposites (day and night, or light and darkness). Bréhier concluded that all this referred to Hesiodic fantasy rather than Ionic thought—and, more significantly, he stressed the fact that positing a pair of opposites as the *arche* is characteristic of Pythagorean dualism. Moreover, despite Parmenides' assimilation of the Ionian structure of the heavens, the latter are to him (as in some Platonic myths) the place of transit of the souls, where necessity (*anangke*) lay, distributing their portions (Aecius, *Synagoge ton areschonton* [*Aetii Placita*], II, 7, 1). Even if there had been no direct Pythagorean influence on Parmenides, it is a fact that the latter denied any truth to the corporeal, physical world that the Pythagoreans deemed despicable; he valued thought, which he deemed to be the only reality (and which is the source of limits, valued by the Pythagoreans), and he insisted in the unreality of movement (disparaged by the Pythagoreans)—hence the objects of the refutations developed by his disciple Zeno of Elea. By denying any existence to what common sense regards as the physical world and asserting thought to be the only truth, Parmenides turned the very root of human deceit, which is thought (as we have seen, when delusorily valued-absolutized), into the only true reality, developing a theory that contradicted his own experience and practice, insofar as, like the rest of human beings, he surely experienced material phenomena as real, and surely avoided venomous snakes, speeding carts and so on. The denial of any degree of truth to corporeal reality may be seen as a more sophisticated instance of the anti-somatic attitude proper of both Orphics and Pythagoreans, which, as we have seen, leads directly to the ecological Armageddon. The harsh words Parmenides (1984) directed toward those to whom "being and nonbeing seem to be the same and not the same" (fr. 6; verses 7-9) show his antagonism to the sayings of Heraclitus and other nondualists (and as such are reminiscent of Ko-hung's attacks on Chuang-tzu [Creel, 1970; Watts 1975b; Ware 1981]). And, in fact, a self-appointed monism that asserts the existence and unity of thought and the nonexistence of a physical world (as a reality different from it), is a subtle dualism insofar as it refers to the physical world as one would refer to something existing and absolutely other with regard to thought (which, as we have seen, is how in their everyday life the Eleatics experienced it and dealt with it), in order to deny its existence intellectually and then assert a reality different from it as the only truth.

(It could be thought that the Eleatic ideology may have been akin to the Mayavada philosophy developed by the Hindu author Gaudapada, inspired by Yogachara Buddhist philosophy. However, Parmenides (1984) does not assert the only truth to be *jñana* or gnosis (in spite of the similarity between *jñana* and *noein*, the latter term means "intellectual intuition," which corresponds to "subtle thoughts" as understood in the Dzogchen teachings), which by definition cannot be expressed by thought (even though it may be said to be the basic "constituent" of thought), but affirms that the only truth is *thought*, identifies thought with being, insists that *the impossibility that something be thought proves its nonexistence*, and [in fr. 8, 34-36] asserts that, "it is the same to think and to think that [the content of thought] *is*, because without being, in what is expressed you could not find thought." The claim that *the impossibility that something be thought proves its nonexistence* implies the claim that the possibility that something be thought, together with the fact that it is actually thought, proves its existence—which, insofar as the contents of thought are manifold, implies the existence of multiplicity. How can someone who posits a monism in which the only true reality is thought = being, make an assertion that clearly implies the existence of multiplicity? The only explanation I can think of is that, since according to him the only true reality was thought = being, and the manifold contents of thought were manifestations of thought, these contents shared the being that was one with thought. However, still his system would clearly breach the principle of noncontradiction, of the excluded middle, or of the excluded third, for he asserted the sole existence (in the ordinary sense of the term) of the single principle that in his system thought = being is, and at the

same time asserted the existence (in the ordinary sense of the term) of the manifold contents of thought. We might try to solve the contradiction by concluding that in his view the single being = thought was the absolute reality, the manifold contents of thought were some kind of relative reality, and the physical world was simply nonexistent. However, in the extant fragments of the book there is no mention of an absolute reality and a relative reality, not are there indications in them that he may have been positing a view like the one just described; therefore, I acknowledge my powerlessness to arrive at a clear, noncontradictory conclusion with regard to the true import of his system.)

Plato's relation with Orphism is evident in *Gorgias* (Plato [1973], 493B), which refers to "one of the wise, who holds the body to be a tomb," and states that in Hades the souls of the uninitiated are absolutely miserable, as they are doomed to an eternity of filling sieves with water by means of other sieves. As we have seen, in *Phaedo* (Plato [1980], 69E) he also referred to the torments the uninitiated face after death. In *Republic* (Plato [1979], 363D), he claimed that Musaeus and Eumolpus increase the rewards of the righteous in the other world and that the initiated punish the uninitiated by means of the punishments considered above. In *Cratylus* (Plato [1998], 402B), he directly attributes to the Orphic poets the doctrine that the body is the soul's tomb. In *Meno* (Plato [1949], 81A), he praises his predecessors in asserting the immortality of the soul. However, Plato was worse than both the Eleatics and the Pythagoreans, for he synthesized the positions of both, developing the first openly proclaimed ontological dualism of ancient Greece (for the first time there were, on the one hand, absolutely nonmaterial, immortal ontological entities such as the *eidos* [and apparently also the demiurge and the souls] and, on the other hand, matter, which was eternal, but which was regarded as nonbeing), and placing truth in a nonphysical, eternal reality of his own invention: the world of *eidos*. This reality replaced the world of *thought* posited by Parmenides as the true reality; however, *seemingly* unlike the latter, the *eidos* existed outside the soul. In turn, nonbeing was no longer the physical world, as in Parmenides, but unformed matter: formed matter, constituting the physical world, was half-false (as it contained matter, which was untruth itself) and half-true (as it contained form [*eidos*], which was truth itself). The immortal souls Plato posited came from the Pythagoreans, and he also incorporated the Pythagorean theory that the soul was corrupted by the body; however, he made perception through the senses the source of contamination, insofar as the knowledge thus obtained replaced the true knowledge (*noein*) of *eidos* that the souls of the would-be philosophers had had before birth, for the half-true, half-false knowledge (opinion or *doxa*) of the half-true, half-false physical reality—which involved contamination by the corruptible and error. As we have seen, just like Parmenides' physical world, matter was nonbeing and falsehood (absence of truth), but it also was, like in the Pythagoreans, evil (absence of good) and ugliness (absence of beauty). These are some of the main elements in Plato's synthesis of Eleatic and Pythagorean thought; a simplified explanation of the reasons why Plato had to proceed this way in order to synthesize the ideas of the two philosophical traditions that he admired most, and of the way in which this synthesis was achieved, was provided in Capriles (2000b); a lengthier and more complete discussion of the subject will appear in Capriles (work in progress 3). To conclude with Plato, it must be noted that, as shown in Koyré (1973), the scientists who developed the vision and project that resulted in the creation of the technological Golem (including Galileo, reputed to have circumscribed science to what can be quantified [Capra, 1988, p. 133; Capra, 1996, p. 39]) replaced Aristotelianism with Platonism.

A more toned down ideology of the same sign is found in Plotinus, who adopted Plato's theory that matter was in itself something formless and indeterminate, and asserted that it was like the term in which the radiance or resplendence of the one, and therefore of the good, became exhausted. In this sense, it could be said that he deemed matter to represent evil (absence of good). And, since beauty was to him the radiance or resplendence of the good or of the one, which became exhausted in matter, the latter could be regarded as ugliness (absence of beauty). Since this implied that matter was different from the one, from good and from beauty, Plotinus' pseudo-monism was but a cover for a subtle ontological dualism and a coarse moral and aesthetical dualism having the defects of the various Orphic-inspired systems referred to above. For a lengthier critique of Plotinus' system, see Capriles (work in progress 3).

In Capriles (1998a), I asserted Indian dualistic, repressive spiritual systems to be either sheer imposition of Indo-European religion (*Rigveda*, *Samaveda*, *Yajurveda*), or more or less pronounced deformations of the doctrines and practices of the pre-Indo-European, nondual Shaiva tradition of Communion, resulting from their assimilation and reformulation in terms of those dualistic, repressive religious ideologies that responded to the oppressive / repressive structure and function of the psyche and social / environmental relationships of the Indo-European invaders, which were among the most representative examples of the

peoples DeMeo (1998) called "Saharasians" (the mutual conditioning of psychic and socioenvironmental structure and function is discussed in Capriles [1990b, 1994a] and Capriles & Hočevar [1991, 1992]). After the initial imposition of Indo-European religion, elements of pre-Indo-European spirituality were assimilated (*Atharvaveda*); then there arose a reaction against this assimilation (*Brahmanas, Aranyakas*; Yoga and Samkhya darshanas); later on, further elements of pre-Indo-European spirituality either were absorbed or manifested spontaneously through the realization of great sages (*Upanishads*, Hinayana Buddhism); then there arose a reaction against this assimilation (Vaishnava theism of the epics and the *Bhagavad Gita*); after this, further elements of pre-Indo-European spirituality either were absorbed or manifested spontaneously through the realization of great sages (Mahayana Buddhism; then the *Vedanta Sutra*, and finally the Vedantic casteist reformulations of Mahayana philosophy: Gaudapada's Mayavada philosophy as an adaptation of Buddhist Yogachara and Shankaracharya's Adwaita Vedanta as a subtly dualistic adaptation of Madhyamaka)—and so on in a succession of assimilations and reactions, so that most Indian spiritual and religious systems combine pre-Indo-European Indian spirituality with Indo-European religion in different manners and proportions, except for the systems that restored the original nondual tradition, such as the various forms of higher Tantra (the most perfect and self-consistent being the Buddhist, which arose after the Vedanta) and the Dzogchen teachings (which reappeared in the ambit of Indian civilization roughly at the time of the appearance of Mahayana Buddhism). Likewise, in the preceding endnote, what Creel called Hsien Taoism—of which Ko-hung was an especially shameful yet equally representative specimen—was explained to be a deformation of the original nondual Taoist tradition of Communion resulting from its reinterpretation in terms of the dualistic, repressive ideologies of the bellicose "Saharasian" peoples who invaded China, such as the Shang and the Chou (or Zhou). We may assume that the Orphic tradition of Greece arose just in the same way as Hsien pseudo-Taoism and the dualistic, repressive spiritual ideologies and practices of India: the original pre-"Saharasian" nondual tradition of Communion, which in the case of Greece consisted in the Dionysian mysteries, was turned upside down upon being reinterpreted in terms of the repressive, dualistic ideologies of the "Saharasian" invaders, which in the case of Greece were two waves of Indo-European peoples, the first one being that of the Achaeans, Ionians and Aeolians, and the second—which, just as in the case of China, was far more oppressive and repressive than the first—that of the Dorians. (The Orphic tradition might have received important Dorian influences, insofar as the pseudophilosophical offshoots of the Orphic initiatic tradition were known for their extreme elitism and aristocraticism, which in the case of the Pythagorean tradition have been traced down to Dorian super-aristocraticism [Capriles 2000b; Cappelletti 1972b]; furthermore, Thrace, where Orphism appears to have arisen around the fourteenth century BCE, seems to have been at the time under Dorian control.) If this theory were correct, just as in India the mythological links between Shiva and the deities of the Indo-European pantheon attest to the fact that the Indo-European invaders felt revolted before the views, doctrines, practices and behavior of Shaivism, yet the development of Indo-European Indian religions attests to a gradual absorption of elements of the views, doctrines, and finally even practices and ways of behavior of Shaivism (the more dualistic and repressive types of Indo-European Indian religion turning the central tenets and methods of Shaivism upside down), in Greece the mythological links between Orpheus and Dionysus would respond to the fact that the Indo-European invaders felt revolted before the Dionysian views, doctrines, practices and behavior—and yet Orphism came to absorb key elements of this tradition while turning its central tenets and behavior upside down.

Heidegger, insofar as he believed truth lay in language and equated truth with being, was in the Orphic line of descent, and may be compared to Aristotle in that, just as Aristotle placed the source of truth in the physical world rather than in a beyond as Plato had done, but kept some of the distinctions that issued from Plato's Orphic substantialism and dualism, Heidegger identified reality with a particular perception of the physical world rather than with the essences thought deals with, and yet kept many of the basic suppositions of Orphic dualistic substantialism. Furthermore, Heidegger's misinterpretation of Heraclitus in terms of Parmenides' postulates shows he failed to understand the Greek philosophers, on whom, as shown below in the regular text of this chapter, he forced his own views, closing his eyes to the striking contrasts between Greek and Modern Western thinkers, and inventing fictions such as the so-called "Western philosophical tradition" and the so-called "Greek way of philosophizing." Furthermore, his work on behalf of the Nazis demonstrates that he was a representative of "Saharasian" ideology.

[184] This translation is based on the one produced by Kirk and published in Kirk, Raven & Schofield (1970). Angel J. Cappelletti (1972a) offers us a more literal translation:

"Articulations: whole and not whole; concordant, discordant; consonantal, dissonant; and from all things, the one' and of the one, all things."

[185] There are many other fragments by Heraclitus that simultaneously assert opposite views, and which, rather than meaning that he thought reality corresponded precisely to our conceptual map if these violated the principle of Non-contradiction, Law of the Excluded Third or Law of the Excluded Middle (as those who have interpreted Heraclitus as a Hegelian *avant la lettre* have understood them), are part of a strategy for breaking the reader's delusory valuation-absolutization of thought at the root of the basic human delusion that causes people to hold to one conceptual extreme as true, and reject the other extreme as false (a strategy that would work only on those who are bound by the principle of non-contradiction, law of the excluded middle or law of the excluded third—which means that it depends on ascribing validity to this principle or law).

[186] Perhaps this is why Plotinus insisted that the unity of the One allows us to consider as a unity each one of the manifold essents.

[187] Shantideva wrote (*Bodhicharyavatara,* IX, 2. The translation in Shantideva [1996], p. 115, differs from this one substantially):

The relative and the absolute
are what is known as the two truths;
the absolute is not an object of knowledge to the mind,
for the mind [and all of its objects are what is] considered as "the relative."

Therefore, the realization of absolute truth amounts to the dissolution of mind.

[188] We have seen repeatedly that the conceptual map cannot correspond to the territory of the given; however, in order use logic to lead deluded beings who mistake the map for the territory and/or take the map to correspond precisely to the territory, it is indispensable that the law of the excluded middle / excluded third or principle of non-contradiction be accepted as an inviolable law or principle of thought. Therefore we must admit that if something is *a* (e.g. being), it cannot be not-*a* (e.g. nonbeing), and therefore *a*-and-not-*a* (e.g. being-and-nonbeing) is an inadmissible or impossible position—unless *a* (e.g. being) were asserted from the standpoint of one level of reality or logical type (in the sense of Russell & Whitehead [1910-1913]) and not-*a* (e.g. nonbeing) were asserted from the standpoint of another level of reality or logical type.

If the Madhyamikas had simply intended to prove intellectually that no position applied to reality, they would have asserted that neither being nor nonbeing applied to reality, for insofar as a third position such as being-and-nonbeing was automatically excluded by the principle of non-contradiction, there would have been no need to explicitly exclude it. However, as we have repeatedly seen, what they intended was to "pull the conceptual carpet from under the mind's feet" so as to lead mind, delusory valuation-absolutization, logic and in general all that makes up relative truth (which, as on the basis of the etymology of the Sanskrit term *samvriti*, Gendün Chöphel [2005] asserts to be "deluded truth") to collapse. Therefore, it would not have done to assert that neither being nor nonbeing applied to reality, which could have resulted in the delusory valuation of a new position—i.e. "neither-being-nor-nonbeing"—as the correct view of reality. Hence, it was necessary to exclude this possibility as well.

However, excluding not only the two possibilities accepted by logic and common sense, which were being and nonbeing, but also the inadmissible possibility consisting in neither-being-nor-nonbeing, could have been interpreted to imply that inadmissible possibilities were admissible, and thus some people could have thought that the idea was that the principle of noncontradiction did not apply, and that the true nature of reality could be expressed in contradictory terms as "being-and-nonbeing." Therefore, insofar as neither-being-nor-nonbeing had to be discarded, also being-and-nonbeing had to be discarded.

[189] The names listed so far are used in Buddhist teachings.

[190] This is the Mandarin term used in Taoism.

[191] This term was used (and is still used) in Shaivism, the pre-Indo-European religion of the Dravidians in India that has continued to exist until our time.

[192] The terms *brahman* and *atman* are used in mystical Brahmanism, and in particular in the *Upanishads*, in the *Vedanta Sutra*, in Gaudapada's *Mayavada* and in Shankaracharya's *Adwaita Vedanta*. Below in the regular text it will be seen that *brahman* is a general name for the absolute, unthinkable reality—which, however, sometimes is used more specifically to refer to all that belongs to what we regard as the "physical world" (just as perhaps in Heraclitus *physis* and *pyr* may have been used more specifically to refer to all that belongs to what we regard as the "physical world"), whereas *atman* is used more

specifically for the manifestation of *brahman* as human consciousness. When so used, the term *paratman* refers to the universal Soul or Mind that is the true, common nature of all human souls or minds (and therefore in Heraclitus it would correspond mainly to *logos*), whereas *jivatman* refers to the individual soul—which, in the view of *Adwaita Vedanta*, is an illusory mask worn by the universal soul rather than an individual, self-existing reality.

[193] This Tibetan term is used in the Bön (*bon*) tradition.

[194] This term was used in Zurvanism, the pre-Indo-European spiritual tradition of Persia.

[195] In agreement with Steve Taylor (Taylor [2003, 2005]), I believe that most primitive/primordial peoples had their own "names of the unnamable." If this were correct, then, among many others, we would have to add the following, cited by Taylor:

Wakataka: This term, which is usually translated as "Great Spirit," but which more precisely means "the force which moves all things," was used (and is still used) by Plain Indians in North America.

Mana: This term is used by Melanesian peoples.

Orenda: This term is used by the Iroquois Indians of North America, whose ancient lands presently lie in both sides of the Canadian-US border.

Maasauu: This is a Hopi Indian term.

Fufaka: This term is used by the Ufaina Indians of the Amazon.

Kwuoth: This term is used by the Nuer of Africa.

Tirawa: This is the "supreme God" of the Pawnee tribe of Plain Indians of North America (of Caddoan linguistic stock), which is not conceived as a person, but as a power that is in everything and that moves everything.

Imunu: This name is used by the natives of the Purari Delta in New Guinea, who regarded it as the soul of everything—so that nothing arrived apart from it and nothing animate or inanimate could exist apart from it.

[196] As seen in the first chapter of this book, the condition called Dzogchen (*rdzogs chen*) may be viewed *qua* Base, *qua* Path and *qua* Fruit. Understood *qua* Base, it is the true nature of all reality; understood *qua* Path, it is the unconcealment of the true nature of all reality while on the Path; understood *qua* Fruit, it is the definitive non-concealment of the true nature of all reality that constitutes the Fruit of Dzogchen. Among the synonyms of the term Dzogchen, the following may be listed: *bodhichitta* or changchubsem (*byang chub sems*), thigle chenpo (*thig le chen po*) or total sphere, thigle chik (*thig le gcig*) or single sphere, dagnyi chenpo (*bdag nyid chen po*) or total I-ness, and so on. Since Buddhist Dzogchen involves a Base, a supramundane Path and a supramundane Fruit, it is a Buddhist vehicle. *Qua* Buddhist vehicle, Dzogchen is also called *Atiyogatantrayana*, *Atiyogatantra* or *Atiyoga* (sometimes I have referred to it by the neologism *Atiyana* as well).

Among the other terms used to refer to Dzogchen and/or to the *Atiyoga* are: *gza' gtad dang bral ba*, *lhun gyis grub pa*, *rang byung ye shes*, *bya btsal dang bral ba*, *bde ba chen po*, *gnyis su med pa*, *mtha' ril ma spangs bral ba'i rang lugs chen po*, *gzhi ji bzhing bar lta be*, etc. These terms are discussed in the *Ati Changsem Gongdzö* (*A ti byang sems dgongs mdzod ces bya ba*), which it would be illegitimate to cite here.

[197] In Pali literature, and in particular in the *Udana*, we find terms such as *ajata*, rendered as unborn; *abhèta*, translated as unbecome; *akata*, rendered as unmade; and *asankhata*, translated as uncompounded or unconditioned: they were used mainly in the rejection of the Hindu attribution of these qualities to the Self (Skt. *atman*; Pali, *atta*), as it would have been legitimate to predicate them only of *nirvana*. In the Mahayana, the concept of *abhèta* was replaced by the one expressed by the Sanskrit terms *anutpada* and *anutpatti*, which, just as the term *asamskrita*, which rendered the Pali *asankhata*, was predicated of all dharmas. The same applies to the Skt. *ajata*, which like the same term in Pali literally means "without birth," and to *animitta*, which is also rendered as unconditioned: both were predicated of all dharmas. And the same applies to the opposites of these terms as well—i.e., to the various terms expressing the absence of cessation—which were also predicated of all dharmas. At any rate, in the Mahayana all of these terms directly imply the concept of *swabhava shunyata*.

[198] Paradoxically, in Heidegger (1943**)**, without using Gadamer's term (which he had not coined at the time), Heidegger himself stressed this distance upon considering the different interpretations of Heraclitus produced by Plato, Aristotle, Clement of Alexandria, Hegel and Nietzsche.

[199] The term is being used here *lato sensu*: it is not used to refer to the philosophy of Jaspers in particular, but to indicate the grouping of the philosophies of authors such as Heidegger in the period of *Being and Time*

(even though later on he declared that even at that stage his main concern was the problem of being rather than the problems of *Existenzphilosophie*), Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, Jaspers, Marcel, Lavelle. Though in this case I am using the term to refer to twentieth century phenomenological philosophers, elsewhere in this book it also refers to the philosophy of Kierkegaard, which is normally considered existentialist or pre-existentialist, but that is rarely placed in the field of *Existenzphilosophie*. The same may apply to the philosophies of Berdaiev and others.

I refrained from using the term "existentialism" because Sartre (1982) defined existentialism as the doctrine according to which *existence precedes essence* (the human individual "makes him or herself," thus giving rise to his or her own essence, rather than being predetermined by a supposedly *a priori*, immutable human essence)—which is a position that Heidegger (1947) rejected on the grounds that the dualism of essence and existence implied the Aristotelian duality of *dynamis* or potency (essence) and *energeia* or act (existence), and claimed that "the *Dasein*'s essence lies in its existence." Moreover, Heidegger detached himself from the humanism that Sartre associated to existentialism and pointed out that the concept of the human at the root of humanism was that of the Roman human being, heir to the Greek human being (*homo humanus* = *homo romanus*).

[200] This fact is universally known and hence there is no need to substantiate it here. For clear proofs of Heidegger's commitment to Nazism during his term as the Rector of the University of Freiburg, cf. Löwith (1988), which makes it clear that Heidegger's acceptance of the position was not simply a compromise assumed in order to be able to carry on with his philosophical activity, but responded to a heartfelt commitment to the Nazi ideology (for some of the evidence, cf. a subsequent note to this chapter, where Löwith also tells us that in his 1936 meeting with Heidegger in Rome, the latter, without useless roundabouts, explained to him how his adherence to National-Socialism was demanded by the very concepts of his philosophy of historicity). However, perhaps the most complete account and a critical appraisal of this may be the one in Münster (2002), on the jacket of which we read:

"If Martin Heidegger's adherence to national-socialism had been, as some want us to believe, merely the result of some 'constraining conditions' due to the political context of the times and mainly to his office as [University] Rector the philosopher assumed in April 1933, that is, of strong political pressures exerted on the philosopher 'from outside,' his 'temporary' implication in the politics of the Nazi regime could have been excused. However, the documents the philosopher's son published in volume XVI of Heidegger's *Complete Works* (*Gesamtausgabe*) evidence and prove that his pro-Nazi political engagement had a breadth and a far greater significance for the philosopher's life and thought, which lasted far longer and which also implies a willing, enthusiastic, almost total adherence of Heidegger to the Nazi ideology and theories, which marks not only the whole of the duration of his office as Rector of the University of Freiburg, but which lasted almost until 1936, the year in which Heidegger began his courses on Nietzsche. This engagement implied not only the unreserved apology by Heidegger of the 'Führer-Staat' [...] and of the 'German science' [...], but also that of the ideology of 'blood and territory' (*Blut und Boden*), of eugenics and of ideas relative to the Nazi doctrine concerning 'racial hygiene'."

Furthermore, as we have already seen, Heidegger asserted that *only* in the German language (and *perhaps* also in Greek) was it possible to philosophize. In *Einführung in die Metaphysik* he further asserted that it is in Europe that the destiny of the Earth will be decided, and that the historical existence of Europe proves its central position (adding that America and Russia, which are like tweezers on both sides of Europe, metaphysically speaking are the same thing [Heidegger 1980, pp. 75, 79]). It is also important to keep in mind Heidegger's relationship with extreme right-wing thinker Ernst Jünger, in homage to whom he wrote the text "Zur Seinsfrage" (Heidegger [1955]), which he presented a text in an act in homage to Jünger.

[201] These three theses are: (1) To the *Dasein* it is inherent, while it is, a "not yet" that he will be: "what lacks" constantly. (2) The "coming to an end" of "what is not yet in the end" in each case (the suppression, in a form adequate to that of the *Dasein*, of "what lacks") has the character or the "no longer being there" (no longer *Dasein*). (3) The "coming to the end" encloses in itself a mode of being absolutely not susceptible of representation with regard to the *Dasein* of the case.

[202] In Heidegger (1996), p. 245 (original German edition, p. 266), Heidegger states quite clearly that "Being-toward-death is essentially *Angst*." In the same work (pp. 232-233; original German edition p. 251) we are told that thrownness into death reveals itself to the *Dasein* more primordially and penetratingly in the attunement of *Angst* (which, as we know, in this period Heidegger understood as the way the *Dasein* revealed to itself a zone or region of being, transcending toward it from the presence of essents—toward

which anguish, depression, etc. make the *Dasein* indifferent). Heidegger says that this anguish manifests in face of being-in-the-world itself, that its reason is the "can be" absolutely of the *Dasein*, and that to mistake it for fear of death is a way to elude ("escape from") this fundamental being in the "state of open(ing)" of which the *Dasein* exists as thrown "being toward the end"—for the anguish in question is not an arbitrary and chance 'weak' mood of the individual but the experience, in its state of open(ing), of its *outmost nonrelational possibility not to be bypassed*: as a fundamental attunement of Da-sein, it is the disclosedness of the fact that Da-sein exists as thrown being-toward-its-end. The "being toward the end" is essentially inherent in the "state of thrownness" of the *Dasein* that uncovers in this or that way in finding oneself. The not knowing factically of death in an immediate and regular manner, far from proving that "being toward death" is not universally inherent in the *Dasein*, indicates that the latter covers up immediately and regularly the most peculiar "being toward death," fleeing before this being.

[203] Here "patency of the *physis*" means that the *physis* is not veiled to a limited, dualistic, thetic, positional, deluded consciousness.

[204] The *Upanishads*, the *Vedanta sutra* and the *Adwaita Vedanta* of India posit a single absolute; however, as stated in a previous note, when they intend to emphasize the aspect that normally would be called "mental" (the single Gnitiveness that manifests as the countless, seemingly individual minds), they call it [*par*]*Atman*, and when they intend to include both this aspect and the aspect that appears as object, or to emphasize the latter, they call it *Brahman*. In the same note it was also stated that Heraclitus referred to the Gnitive, intelligent aspect of the universal principle mainly by the name *logos*, and that it *may have been* when he intended to include both this aspect and the aspect that appears as object, or to emphasize the latter, that he called it *physis* and *pyr*. However, whereas the *Upanishads*, the *Vedanta sutra* and *Adwaita Vedanta* consider *Brahman* to be transcendent, Fr. 30 DK (Marcovich 51) of Heraclitus' book may be thought to suggest an immanentist vision, insofar as it explicitly states:

This Kosmos, *the same one for all, was not made by any of the gods or men, but always was, is and will be ever living Fire, which according to measures is lit and according to measures becomes extinguished*.

[205] This does not mean that Heraclitus fell into the error of positing oneness as the absolute: we have seen that, in a bid to lead beyond the delusory valuation of concepts, his book repeatedly affirms contradictory concepts. Above in the regular text of this book Fr. DK 206 was cited in Kirk's translation (Kirk, Raven & Schofield [1970]), and then in a note in Cappelletti's (1972a; see also 1969) translation.

[206] Possibly in animistic and shamanic communities it may also be possible to experience oneself as an object of these essents, and thus to experience them as subjects (cf. Capriles [1990b]). However, in civilized, scientific minded societies they are normally experienced solely as object.

[207] Heraclitus is asserting the Gnitiveness which (is) the aware, intelligent aspect of the *physis* (i.e. of that which the Dzogchen teachings call the Base and that in Part II of this book I call the Self-*qua*-Base), which I have also referred to by the term primordial awareness and which he calls the *logos*, to be the Gnitive, intelligent principle behind all seemingly dualistic, individual and substantial consciousnesses. Contrarily to Heidegger's *Dasein*, this Gnitiveness, insofar as it is common to all, is not limited in space and time, and thus it may be compared to the unborn and undying luminosity that shines like the first light of dawn. (The reason why I write "Gnitiveness" and "Gnitive principle" rather than "cognitiveness" and "cognitive principle" was expounded in the notes to the first chapter of this book, when the term "Gnitiveness" was defined.)

Though (as will be shown in Part II of this book) the continuous, most basic manifestation of this awareness or Gnitiveness is nondual, non-thetic, non-positional, and non-reflexive, when *samsara* manifests, in this awareness or Gnitiveness, as in a mirror, there manifests a dualistic, thetic, reflexive consciousness that is concomitant with the appearance of there being a separate, autonomous mental subject, with which it is confused—so that consciousness seems to be the consciousness of a mental subject or soul.

[208] Actually, the *Kehre* or turnabout was not sudden, as the term suggests, but a continuous process that began shortly after the culmination and publication of *Being and Time*. By the time Heidegger taught the 1927 course transcribed in Heidegger (1988), he had already abandoned the positions of *Being and Time*, and being was no longer what is open to the *Dasein* but was what makes the *Dasein*'s openness possible, truth was no longer the *Dasein*'s state of openness but was a kind of illumination by being (*not* in the sense of *bodhi* or Awakening, but of "shedding light on"), etc. However, at this point Heidegger had not yet given birth to the idea that it was poetry that had the power to express being, because being had to be commemorated so that it would not fall into oblivion, and that this implied it should be protected against description, explanation and interpretation; that the way to apprehend being lay in not trying to

apprehend it; that the human existent must remain where it is (in a *Lichtung* in the woods), without trying to force reality by technical means (i.e. without trying to tame or destroy the woods), in order to allow being to trans-appear (an attitude that, contrarily to other aspects of his thought, is in diametric opposition to Pythagorean scientism); that being is a sort of grace and that the human existent does not have to clear the way in order to experience this grace, but simply let it be and simultaneously let him or herself be carried away by it… and so on.

Therefore, I am not at all sure we can speak of a *Kehre* or turnabout in Heidegger's thinking; perhaps it would be far more correct to speak of a progressive modification of his perspective that nonetheless never really broke with the positions of *Being and Time*—i.e. to view the change in Heidegger's way of thinking as evolution rather than revolution.

[209] In the preceding note, I stated that there was not a precise *Kehre* or turnabout in Heidegger's thinking, for the change in his thought was a progressive process of evolution rather than a sudden revolution. This is evident in the development of the concept of *aletheia*. At the time of *Being and Time*, Heidegger deemed that what could be referred to as "originary" was what he called *aletheia* and wrongly identified with Heraclitus' understanding of this term, whereas what he limitedly considered as *lethe* or occultation took place *a posteriori.* Then, in a subsequent stage of his thought, what the author regarded as *aletheia* or patency and what he conceived as *lethe* or concealment arose co-emergently. Finally, in a last stage of his thought, what he regarded as *lethe* was originary, and what he wrongly regarded as *aletheia* arose subsequently. In this last stage, being no longer appeared to the *Dasein* as the "open," but rather was that which made possible the very openness (*Da*) of the *Dasein.* In its turn, truth (*aletheia*) was no longer the *Dasein*'s openness, but illumination (in the sense of "shedding light") by being, a kind of protection of being *qua* presence.

[210] The translation and interpretation of this fragment by the late Miroslav Marcovich (1967) was: *How can any one escape the notice of that which never sets*? (i.e. how can someone go unnoticed to that which never sets?). As shown by his translation of Fr. DK 66 ("Fire, having come suddenly upon them, will judge and convict all [living beings]"), Marcovich imagined "that which never sets" to be fire (*pyr*) conceived as an anthropomorphic god that will judge all living beings after death. Thus Heidegger's and Marcovich's interpretations of the fragment could hardly be more divergent—Marcovich's diametrically contradicting the Ephesian's intent in a most outrageous manner by presenting him as an advocate of Saharasian anthropomorphic religions of judgment-repression-punishment, and Heidegger's being much closer to Heraclitus' true intent.

[211] This is the correct interpretation of the term *aion*, which is the one given it by J. Bernays (1885, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, Berlin: H. Usener, Ed. I, p. 56 *et seq*.), H. Diels (1909, *Herakleitos von Ephesos*; Berlin / 1909, Heraclitus, in Hastings, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, VI, pp. 591-594. 4th Ed. 1922, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*; Berlin [also in subsequent Eds. by W. Kranz]), J. Burnet (1892, *Early Greek Philosophy*. 1901, Review of Diels' *Herakleitos*, in Classical Review 15, pp. 423b-424a), H. Herter (1961, Das Leben ein Kinderspiel, in *Bonner Jahrbücher* 161, p. 81 et seq.), K. Deichgräber (1963, *Rhytmische Elemente im Logos des Heraclit*; Wiesbaden), W. K. C. Guthrie (1962, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, p. 478 n. 2; Cambridge). However, W. Kranz, H. Fränkel, E. Degani, C. J. Classen and M. Marcovich interpret *aion* as referring to the human lifetime, and others have interpreted the Greek term as referring to the general experience of time. Cf. Marcovich (1967), pp. 493-494. Though the principal meaning of the term is incontrovertibly that of "cosmic time cycle," thus being the equivalent of the Sanskrit *kalpa*, in Heraclitus its meaning is likely to encompass the latter two interpretations.

[212] The only apparent reason why Heraclitus could have said that kingship belongs to the child with which he compared the *aion* is the same one why in the Tantra of the Semde series of Dzogchen teachings called *Kunje Gyälpo* (*Kun byed rgyal po*) or the "All-creating King," the nature of mind is referred to as All-creating King: because all that appears may be said to be part of the "play" of this nature. In fact, in Capriles (2004) (the definitive, corrected version of which will soon be available in print), we read:

"…in Tantric Buddhism and Dzogchen *samsara* and *nirvana* are but two ways of functioning of what the Dzogchen teachings call the Base or zhi (*gzhi*), and both ways of functioning manifest from the same source. In the root Tantra of the Dzogchen Semde, the *Kunje Gyälpo*, Samantabhadra, the state of *dharmakaya*, says (Namkhai Norbu & Clemente [1999], p. 94):

"'There is nobody apart from me who has created dualism'.

"As Chögyal Namkhai Norbu remarked (*ibidem*), this does not mean Samantabhadra has intentionally and concretely carried out an act of creation; what it means is that nothing exists apart from the Base that is the true condition of the individual. In other words, there is nothing apart from our true nature that may have created both the world and ourselves, that may have given rise to *samsara*, or that may continue to maintain *samsara* at every instant. At any rate, this type of view is at the root of the myth of *lila* (Tib. rölpa [*rol pa*])—'the play'—which, as we have seen, represents the universe as a hide-and-seek game universal awareness plays with itself."

Thus in Buddhist Dzogchen and Inner Tantra in general there is no idea of a deity that gets bored due to solitude and self-sameness, which is an absurd hypothesis except as a myth addressed to children and child-like human beings, for, as shown in the first chapter of this book and others of my works, boredom can only manifest when there is the illusion of a subject-object duality—an illusion that arises after the hide-and-seek of primordial Gnitiveness with itself has manifested, as one of the most basic deceptive appearances of this game. What these systems posit is an impersonal Base that gives rise to its energy aspect, called thukje (*thugs rje*) or "compassion" and corresponding to the process of manifestation and the manifested, which (as stated in a note to the first chapter of this volume) is called by this name because when someone attains Buddhahood what happens is that he or she no longer, even for an instant, believes or feels him or herself to be different from the Base; therefore, if a Buddha-*qua*-Fruit keeps alive after Awakening due to a compassion that is non-referential, the Buddha-nature-*qua*-Base may be said to manifest the energy or thukje aspect due to a compassion that is non-referential (the point being that, if such compassion manifests in those who never again believe or feel themselves to be different from the Base, then it must necessarily be inherent in the Base, and must be what gives rise to manifestation).

Kant posited *a priori* forms of sensitiveness in order to justify the supposed objectivity and absoluteness of space and time; he posited *a priori* concepts of the Understanding in order to validate the truth of human knowledge in general and science in particular; he posited *a priori* judgments of the Capacity of Judgment in order to prove the artistic tastes and teleological religious ideas of his culture to be objective and universal; and he posited *a priori* ideas and ideals of Reason in order to prove the supposedly objective, universal character of the morality of his culture. As I noted in Capriles (1994a), in the light of the myth of *lila*, if these forms of sensitiveness, concepts, judgments, and ideas and ideals were *a priori* (as seems to actually be the case with *some of them*, for as Kant made it clear it seems hardly possible that, for example, concepts such as causality and so on may have been inferred from experience), insofar as the myth of *lila* implies that in their first years of life all human beings have to develop the basic delusion called *avidya* or marigpa, the *a priori* character of concepts and of teleological judgments would imply their falsity, and the *a priori* character of aesthetic judgments and ideas and ideals would imply the hollowness of many of these. (As noted in Capriles [1994a, 1997a, 2000b], the aesthetic tendency to appreciate some landscapes, as well as certain ideas and ideals, such as those of equality, justice and so on, are wholesome even though they are products of delusion that in some cases appear to be *a priori*. However, in many cases artistic tastes, and in general many ideas and ideals, are culturally conditioned rather than being *a priori*.)

Heidegger noted that the understanding of being was logically prior to the cognition of essents and hence asserted this understanding to be *a priori*—even though, unlike Kant, he was not thereby positing a set of compartments of the psyche, or assuming Kant's premises with regard to a prioris. However, the fact that this understanding is *a priori*, in the perspective of the myth of *lila* would demonstrate it to be delusive.

[213] Not all forms of Buddhism referred symbolically to human life and experience in terms of the myth of *lila*. On the other hand, among Indian religions, not only Buddhist Tantrism and Dzogchen, but also all forms of Shaivism and in general all forms of Tantrism, referred symbolically to human life and experience in terms of the myth of *lila*. In fact, it is in some Hindu traditions that *lila* is conceived as the play of a god with himself, and that anthropomorphic similes such as that of boredom (rejected in a previous note except as a metaphor for children and the child-like) are employed.

However, even in those forms of Buddhism that do not *explicitly* assert the dream of multiplicity to arise playfully, we never find the claim that "essents are paying a punishment for their separation," or anything of the kind. Therefore, Jaeger's interpretation of "Anaximander's fragment" (which the layman will find below) could hardly be most absurd. However, he may be excused for his confusion insofar as, at the time he produced his interpretation, historians of Western philosophy were not obliged to have a sound understanding of Eastern thought. He who may not be so excused is Hans-Georg Gadamer, who at a time when Eastern thought had been elucidated to a sizeable extent and when its philosophical importance

was universally accepted, and despite having been a disciple of Heidegger and as such being obliged to have a good grasping of his teacher's Eastern sources, dared to write (Gadamer [1995], p. 97):

"...Jaeger, in particular, has done a good job in showing that the language used by Anaximander does not express any mystic religiosity of a Buddhist type, according to which individuation would be a fault or blame and as such it should be punished with a penalty."

All forms of Buddhism posit the unreality of the supposedly individual soul, and the Mahayana and other higher forms of Buddhism insist that there is no multiplicity of substances whatsoever. Therefore, *in truth* essents have never been truly separated. Moreover, no essent (human or not) is responsible for the illusion of substantial multiplicity, for this illusion is prior to the existence of essents: *it is this illusion that gives rise to the deceptive appearance of there being manifold essents*. How could the essents that have been illusorily individuated by the play of the single universal principle be guilty of a sin because of their own individuation, and as a result of it be paying a punishment? Furthermore, blame and guilt are Judeo-Christian-Muslim ideas that have no place in Buddhism—a fact Nietzsche (1920) had already realized one century before Gadamer incurred in the blunder being discussed, as may be appreciated in the passage quoted in the Introduction to this volume:

"Buddhism is a hundred times as realistic as Christianity—it is part of its living heritage that it is able to face problems objectively and coolly; it is the product of long centuries of philosophical speculation. The concept, "god," was already disposed of before it appeared. Buddhism is the only genuinely *positive* religion to be encountered in history, and this applies even to its epistemology (which is a strict phenomenalism). It does not speak of a "struggle with sin," but, yielding to reality, of the "struggle with suffering." Sharply differentiating itself from Christianity, it puts the self-deception that lies in moral concepts behind it; it is, in my phrase, *beyond* good and evil."

[214] This may seem to be a reference to the Tantric Buddhist concept of *lalita*, the dance, which Shaivism, in its turn, expressed in terms of the Nataraj or "Lord of the Dance" form of Shiva.

[215] The passion of infants is playing, and in general whatever they do when they are not compelled to do something "serious," they carry it out in a playful manner, as fantasy rather than "reality."

In fact, it is generally assumed that in young children, at the stage Wilber calls fulcrum-2, mind and world are not clearly differentiated, so the characteristics of these two tend to get fused and confused (Wilber [1996a], p. 173). Wilber wrongly extrapolated this fusion and confusion to primitive humans, claiming that what he called "typhonic man" would "tend to confuse psychic with external reality, almost as a man does when he dreams" (Wilber [1981], p. 46 **of Spanish translation**). As Steve Taylor (2003) rightly noted, if this were so, "primitive" humans would not have survived, just as an infant at this stage cannot survive without the help of adults.

It is important to note, however, that when infants experience pain or other unpleasant experiences, they no longer approach these experiences playfully or, in any sense, as fancy, and the same happens when they are forced to do something against their will. Sartre (1980) tells us that when a child has his or her first job he or she assumes the new role as play, so that if the job is as a butcher the child begins by playing at being a butcher. However, as time passes, the individual takes the role seriously and comes to think of him or herself as *being the role*; in the case of the butcher, the child forgets that he is playing at being a butcher and comes to think of himself as a butcher.

Furthermore, since adults take life "seriously" rather than approaching it playfully, and take is as being real rather than fantasy-like, they impose their vision on children, who otherwise would damage many of the things adults take to be real, serious things they appreciate, or might put their own lives in risk, and so on. Therefore, they often resort to violence in order to make children take life and their own roles seriously. R. D. Laing wrote (1970, Knot 1):

"They are playing a game.
They are playing at not playing a game.
If I show them I see they are, I shall break the rules and they will punish me.
I must play their game, of not seeing I see the game."

It is significant that the etymology of the verb to delude, as expressed in the Latin *de-ludere*, may be viewed as meaning that we *di*-vert our gaze from the fact that the game (*ludus*) is a game, or from the fact that what we are doing is to play (*ludere*).

[216] We may say literally that earth, water, air, fire and space are all manifestations of a universal principle that in itself is not determinate, but that, in each of these elements, manifests the determinations corresponding to them. Contrariwise, it would be absurd to say literally that fire is water or that water is

fire (as fire is virtually water's *differentia specifica* and, therefore, without its contrast with the other element each of them would cease to be what it is). This is why Anaximander's thought reached a much higher degree of abstraction than Tales': the *arche* was for him what in itself had no limits, but which, upon acquiring illusory limits, acquired the appearance of the various elements and of the countless essents of the universe. Though Anaximenes went back to the degree of abstraction of Tales, a thinker of the stature Heraclitus reveals in his book could not have been speaking at the level of abstraction of Tales and Anaximenes, and necessarily must have posited fire as the *arche* in a *metaphorical* sense. (My explanation of why Tales posited water as the *arche*, which contrasts with the most widely accepted explanations of this fact, will be given in the upcoming book *Greek Philosophy and the East*.)

[217] In the Buddhist Tantras, as in various roughly analogous systems, the true constituent of all reality is often represented as energy—which is how, as we all know, contemporary physics represents this basic constituent. In fact, according to the Dzogchen teachings, all is the total thigle (*thig le*), which means "sphere" and represents the fact that the true nature of all reality is unthinkable (for corners represent limits, and concepts are limits insofar as, having a *differentia specifica*, they always exclude something); however, in Tantrism the term "thigle" refers to the basic energy that circulates through the body's energy-channels (this circulation being what is referred to by the Sanskrit terms *vayu* and *prana* and the Tibetan lung *[rlung*], and these channels being what is referred to by the Sanskrit term *nadi* and the Tibetan term tsa [*rtsa*])—and in Dzogchen this is a secondary meaning of the term. Furthermore, sometimes the Tantric teachings explain the universe as being made of thigle (*thig le*) energy, which circulates as lung (*rlung*) in tsa (*rtsa*)-like configurations, thus giving rise to what we refer to as "material essents."

As we have seen, there is conclusive evidence that Himalayan Bön (at least since around 1800 BC) had Dzogchen and Mantric (Tantric) teachings, and there is evidence that Shaivism and Taoism also had similar teachings. Since, as stated in a previous note, these three systems were expressions of the single pan-Eurasian tradition of which the Dionysian mysteries were the Greek expression, and of which Tantric and Dzogchen Buddhism arose as late branches and flowers, the fact that the Buddhist Tantras posit energy as the basic constituent of all reality suggests a similar conception *may have* existed in the Dionysian tradition—of which, as already noted, in my view Heraclitus was most likely a representative.

Furthermore, it is well known that, according to astrophysics, all heavenly bodies that nowadays are not fiery were originally igneous: at the beginning, before the differentiation of elements and entities, everything was in a fiery condition, and therefore it would make sense to say that the *arche*, in the limited sense of "what was at the beginning," is fire.

[218] A German translation of this book (Padmasambhava according to Karma Lingpa [1938]) was published in Zurich (Switzerland) and Leipzig (Germany) by Rascher Verlag in 1938. At any rate, the association of *Lichtung* with "dawn" or "aurora" would only seem to make some sense if understood in the sense of the luminosity that the *Bardo Thödröl* (or *Tibetan Book of the Dead*) compares to the first luminosity of dawn that uniformly pervades a cloudless sky—which, however, *only metaphorically* may be said to be "perennially rising," since literally speaking only what is unborn can be undying and hence *from a logical standpoint* what has no setting can only be what has no rising. (Heidegger could have avoided this logical inaccuracy, while nonetheless interpreting Heraclitus' fire as luminosity, by saying "that which, being beyond the contraposition of rising and setting, perennially shines like the first light of dawn" instead of "that which is always rising;" since he failed to do so, one may wonder whether he was forcing concepts to allude to the Empire of the Rising Sun, which was Germany's ally in World War II and for which, as shown in the regular text of this chapter, he expressed his admiration). At any rate, in the penultimate paragraph of Heidegger (1943), we are told that *Lichtung* involves a shining that is qualified as "invisible." By this our author possibly meant that it was beyond the duality of seer and seen, for he stated that *das Ereignis* or *das reine Ereignen*—with which, as will be seen in the passage quoted below, in this period he identified this clarity or luminosity—could not be dualistically apprehended (if we turned the English noun "presence" into a verb, this could be expressed in terms of the phrase "it cannot be *pre-senced*"). The passage reads:

"But the golden gleam of the *Lichtung*'s invisible shining cannot be grasped, because it is not itself something grasping. Rather, it is *das reine Ereignen*." (As expressed here the phrase does not make sense; for example, a handle is not something grasping [i.e. something that grasps] and yet it can be grasped. However, there seems to be no doubt that what Heidegger meant was that the *Lichtung* is beyond the grasper-grasped duality)

At any rate, it is based on assertions like the one in the above quotation that some have speculated that the *Lichtung* may have been what the Dzogchen teachings call the Base. However, to begin with, rather than the Base itself, clarity-luminosity is a most basic manifestation of the energy or thukje (*thugs rje*) aspect of the Base; in particular, a luminosity comparable to the one that at the beginning of dawn uniformly pervades a cloudless sky, should be the instance of the dang [*gdangs*] form of manifestation of energy called tingsel (*gting gsal*) that appears in the chikhai bardo (*'chi kha'i bar do*) (which, if neither reGnized nor dualistically cognized, is an instance of the condition of the base-of-all or kunzhi [*kun gzhi*] in which neither *samsara* nor *nirvana* are active; if reGnized, it is an instance of *nirvana*; and if dualistically cognized, is an instance of *samsara*). In fact, if the luminosity in question were the one referred to in the *Bardo Thödröl*, instead of saying that it cannot be *pre-senced* because it is neither one who apprehends not something apprehensible, the correct thing would have been to say that it is apprehended correctly *only* when it is reGnized in a nondual way, beyond the subject-object duality and beyond all concepts, in the manifestation of *nirvana*, and that *when it is dualistically apprehended this apprehension is the first step in the* samsara*, which will serve as the base for the next steps in its development*. (It is worth noting that the conception of the luminosity in question as "that which is always rising" and as *das reine Ereignen* or *das Ereignis* led followers of Heidegger to produce curious diagrammatic interpretations; for example, Venezuelan professor Alberto Rosales explained it in terms of a circle.)

Furthermore, *das reine Ereignen*, with which Heidegger identified the *Lichtung*'s invisible shining, involves the identification of being and *arche* that, as stated in the preceding chapter, is contradictory insofar as the *arche* has neither *genus proximum* nor *differentia specifica* and as such can have no appellative force, whereas in Heidegger's view the word *being* has such force. The Chinese scholar Chung-yuan Chang (1977b, cited in Saviani [2004], p. 67) tells us that in his conversation with Heidegger the notion of *Lichtung* was identified with the Taoist concept of *ming*, meaning "diluted" or "clear." However, Reinhard May (1996), who claims that the late Heidegger tried to conceal his debt with the East, tells us that this is an error, for *Lichtung* as understood by Heidegger was equivalent to the concept of *wu*. However, this is not precise either, for, as will be shown below in the regular text, *wu*, which roughly corresponds to the essence or ngowo (*ngo bo*) aspect of the Base, may be predicated of the Base, but as we have seen *Lichtung* qua *das reine Ereignen* may not be predicated of the Base insofar as it involves the contradictory identification of being and *arche* (which implies that what unveils in *aletheia* is being, which is conceptual). Finally, it would be necessary to warn also that *only from the standpoint of its own totality* may it be said that this *Lichtung* is beyond veiling and unveiling, so that one cannot hide from it.

To conclude with this discussion of *Lichtung*, it must be noted that in Heidegger's usage the term has many hues. In *Holzwege*, for example, it may be read in the sense of "clearing" (as in the case of a "clearing in the woods"), in that of "a beam of light in the thickness of the woods"—and, in the latter context, of "chiaroscuro."

[219] Cf. the immediately preceding note.

[220] Löwith (1988). The author is referring to his own experiences with Heidegger; when he met him at a conference in Venice, the German thinker was bearing the black swastika of the Nazis on his arm, and snubbed Löwith, who was an old acquaintance of his, because of Löwith's Jewish roots.

[221] See note 206. As will be shown in the last chapter of Part II of this book, only in a metaphenomenological sense, and never in a chronological one, may unconcealedness be said to be prior to concealment. In fact, chronologically we cannot find unconcealedness by retroceding: we can find the more wholesome, more spontaneous and more panoramic condition of early infancy, which, however, comprises undeveloped delusion—and if we go farther back we find the shining forth of the clear light of the Void in the chikhai bardo (*'chi kha'i bar do*), but in the case of ordinary beings this light has not been reGnized and therefore it cannot be viewed as a manifestation of *nirvana* unconcealing the true nature of what the Dzogchen teachings call the Base or zhi (*gzhi*). Only in the case of individuals who reGnized the clear light in the chikhai bardo after death may it be said that the *aletheia* that took place at the time is prior to the *lethe* of the present lifetime. However, even in such cases, in terms of Buddhism it would be imperative to question whether *aletheia* is prior to all manifestations of *lethe*, for Buddhism speaks of beginningless *samsara* and of the end of *samsara* upon the manifestation of irreversible Awakening. Finally, from the standpoint of logic, it would make little sense to assert that *lethe* precedes *aletheia* or that *aletheia* precedes *lethe*, for each is the other's *differentia specifica*.

[222] In Heidegger (1951), which, given its late date, may be viewed as the German author's final word in this regard, he discussed his understanding of Heraclitus' conception of the *logos* on the basis of fragment DK (B) 50. He wrote:

"One among the virtually identical translations reads:

"When you have listened not to me but to the Meaning,
it is wise within the same Meaning to say: One is All.

(Snell)

"The saying speaks of *akouein*, hearing and having heard, of *omologein*, to say the same, of *logos*, what is said and the saying, of *ego*, the thinker himself as *legon*, the one who is talking. Heraclitus here considers a hearing and a saying. He expresses what the *logos* says: *En Panta*, all is One. The saying of Heraclitus seems comprehensible in every respect. Nevertheless, everything about it is worthy of question. Most question-worthy is what is most self-evident, namely, our presupposition that whatever Heraclitus says ought to become immediately obvious to our contemporary everyday understanding. This demand was probably never met even for Heraclitus' contemporaries."

This seems to be so, for only those who have repeatedly had the *aletheia* of the *physis* can instantaneously comprehend expressions like those he produced: this is why he was referred to as "the obscure." In fact, Diogenes Laërtius ridiculed him, portraying him as a madman, whereas Plato and Aristotle distorted his intent, deriding him. Heidegger acknowledges that (*ibidem*):

"Since antiquity, the *logos* of Heraclitus has been interpreted in various ways: as Ratio, as Verbum, as cosmic law, as the logical, as necessity in thought, as meaning and as reason. Again and again a call rings out for reason to be the standard for deeds and omissions. Yet what can reason do when, along with the irrational and the antirational all in the same level, it perseveres in the same neglect, forgetting to meditate on the essential meaning of reason and to let itself into its advent? What can logic, *logike* (*episteme*) of any sort, do if we never begin to pay heed to the *logos* and follow its primordial essence?"

However, then he says:

"What *logos* is we gather from *legein*. What does *legein* mean? Everyone familiar with the language knows that *legein* means talking and saying; *logos* means *legein* as a saying aloud, and *legomenon* as that which is said.

"Who would want to deny that in the language of the Greeks from early on *legein* means to talk, say, or tell? However, just as early and even more originally—and therefore already in the previously cited meaning—it means what our similarly sounding (German word) *legen* means: to lay down and lay before. In *legen* a "bringing together" prevails, the Latin *legere* understood as *lesen*, in the sense of collecting and bringing together. *Legein* properly means the laying-down and laying-before which gathers itself and others. The middle voice, *legesthai*, means to lay oneself down in the gathering of rest; *lechos* is the resting place; *lochos* is a place of ambush [or a place for lying to rest] where something is laid away and deposited. (The old word *alego* [*a cupulativum*], archaic after Aeschylus and Pindar, should be recalled here: something 'lies upon me', it oppresses and troubles me.)

"All the same it remains incontestable that *legein* means, predominately if not exclusively, saying and talking. Must we therefore, in deference to this preponderant and customary meaning of *legein*, which assumes manifold forms, simply toss the genuine meaning of the word, *legein* as *laying*, to the winds? Dare we ever do such a thing? Or is it not time to engage ourselves with a question which probably decides many things? The question asks: How does the proper sense of *legein*, to lay, come to mean saying and talking"

Heidegger goes on to conclude that the primary meaning of *logos* was that of "to put," of "extending before;" thus also of "to present after having gathered [and of having been gathered]." Hence, the *logos* would be the result of a *legein* ("to speak," "to say," "to tell [a story]"), which essentially would consist in a harvest. In this light, most of the fragments in which Heraclitus uses the term *logos* would hardly make sense; in terms of it, what could be the meaning of "the *logos* likes to hide," or of "though the *logos* is common, each human being believes he or she has a separate, particular and private intellect"? (In order to find the true meaning of this "to gather" [*lesen*] in the sense of the reading of something written, perhaps we may remember Suidas' words: "He was the scribe of the *physis*, dipping his pen into Mind.")

The term *Logos* is rightly capitalized (as is also the *En Panta* in this particular fragment) insofar as, in Heraclitus' fragments in general, it refers to the Gnitive, intelligent aspect of the universal principle (*arche*). Heidegger himself acknowledged that (among other interpretations) the meaning of the term *logos* in Heraclitus has been since antiquity understood as Ratio, as Cosmic Law and as Reason (e.g. by the Stoics). In Capriles (work in progress 3), I explain the method I have referred to as "metaontological

hermeneutics," which is the way to come to a correct interpretation of those texts conveying what I call "the meta-ontological difference:" the difference between *lethe* and *aletheia*, which can only be made by those in whose Gnitive continuum the delusive experience of *samsara* and the undistortedness of *nirvana* have alternated repeatedly, and each time *samsara* has manifested again, the contrast between one condition and the other has been clearly perceived. What I call "metaontological hermeneutics" is the interpretation of such texts by those having familiarity with the "meta-ontological difference" to the degree of understanding correctly, in a natural, spontaneous way, metaontological texts of any civilization and period. The meaning of each term is determined in an organic and holistic way in each of the contexts in which the author used it, so that the mutual implication of meaning of the different terms used by the author may disclose an overall meaning that be in agreement with the interpreter's own metaontological hermeneutics of the dynamic of *samsara* and *nirvana*. (This explanation is an oversimplification; a detailed and complete explanation of what I call "metaontological hermeneutics" will be provided in Capriles [work in progress 3].)

In conclusion, it is correct to understand the term as *Ratio*, Cosmic Law and *Reason*, but only insofar as these three are understood as synonyms—in other words, provided that "Reason" is not understood in the narrow sense proper or rationalism, but in a much wider sense that includes what Gregory Bateson called "the algorithms of the heart" and even the intelligence at work in natural processes throughout the ecosphere and the universe in general. Blaise Pascal said: *le cœur a ses rasons que la raison ne connaît pas* (the heart has its reasons that reason does not know). The reason that does not know the reasons of the heart is not the *logos* as understood by Heraclitus, but a secondary, insignificant aspect of it; the *logos* as understood by Heraclitus includes, (1) the works of reason in the sense Pascal gave the term, (2) what he called "the reasons of the heart"—and, as just noted, also (3) the intelligence inherent in the whole of nature, which allows all animals, all organs, all plants and the whole of the ecosphere to perform their functions in a masterful way.

The above shows the nonsense of understanding the fragment by Heraclitus Heidegger discussed as,

"When you have listened not to me but to the Meaning,
it is wise within the same Meaning to say: One is All..."

It is clear that what Heraclitus is saying is that:

"When you pay attention, not to me (*qua* apparently separate individual), but to the intelligence (or the mental aspect) of the (universal *physis*, which is the) *logos*, it is wise on the basis of this (universal) intelligence (or mental aspect) to conclude that all is One."

However, as we have seen, this does not at all mean that Heraclitus thought that the *physis* / *logos* / *pyr* could be validly understood in terms of the concept of "One:" it is evident that Heraclitus knew that the universal principle (*arche*), having neither *genus proximum* nor *differentia specifica*, could not be validly understood in terms of concepts. This is why he recurrently resorted to paradox, and it is specifically the reason why he wrote:

"Things as a whole are whole and non-whole, identical and not-identical, harmonic and not-harmonic; the one is born from the whole and from the one all things are born."

If all were one and one were all, the one would not be born from the whole; rather, the whole would be the one and the one would be the whole: as noted in the regular text of this chapter, the one is born from the whole when the whole is understood in terms of the concept of one, and once we have the concept of one, we can understand each of the segments we single out within the whole as being one—giving rise to the plurality of things.

As also seen in the regular text of this chapter, Heraclitus tells us as well that "the *logos* likes to hide," and that "though the *logos* is common, each human being believes him or herself to have a separate, particular and private intellect or soul." There can be no doubt that what these fragments state is that the Gnitiveness-intelligence of the universal *physis*, which is the *logos*, naturally conceals itself by giving rise to the illusion, in each and every different individual, that Gnitiveness-intelligence is a separate, particular and private intellect or soul that thinks, decides, acts and knows. This is what Shaivism referred to as the hide-and-seek play (*lila*) Shiva plays with himself: "he" hides "his" true condition from the consciousness of each and every sentient being, by giving rise to the illusion, in each and every illusory sentient being, that the sentient being in question has a separate, particular, private and autonomous intellect or soul that thinks, decides, acts and knows—when in truth the principle that is responsible for thought, decisions, acts and knowledge in all human beings is the universal Gnitiveness which Shaivism represented as Shiva, which Heraclitus called *logos*, and which Buddhism referred to by

names such as *chittata* (Tib. semnyi [*sems nyid*]), *chitta eva* (Tib. semnyi [*sems nyid*]), *swasamvedana* (Tib. rangrig [*rang rig*]), and so on.

Heidegger's wrong identification of *logos* and being is summarized in the following words, which are pertinent to the meaning of *lethe* and *aletheia* (p. 76):

"In the thinking of Heraclitus the Being (presencing) of beings appears as *o logos*, as the laying down that gathers. But this lightning-flash of Being remains forgotten. And this oblivion remains hidden, in its turn, because the conception of *logos* is forthwith transformed. Thus, early on and for a long time it was inconceivable that the Being of beings could have brought itself to language in the word *o logos*…

"What would have come to pass had Heraclitus—and all the Greeks after him—thought the essence of language expressly as *logos*, as the laying that gathers! Nothing less that this: the Greeks would have thought the essence of language from the essence of Being—indeed, as this itself."

As we have seen, for Heidegger *das Sein* was a term that, upon being pronounced, heard or thought, gave rise to a particular conception, for it conserved what he called "its appellative force." Hence when Heidegger identified the *logos* with being, he wrongly presented the *arche* as being conceptual and hence as having a *differentia specifica*. Furthermore, by saying "the Greeks" thought language as the essence of being (which, as we have seen, is *his own view* in this regard), he overlooked the well-known fact that the position of the Eleatics (whose roots are Orphic) was contrary to that of Heraclitus (whose roots are Dionysian) and reduced the whole of Greek thought to the position generally attributed to Parmenides—whose words on this subject in fragment III (in Heidegger's own translation [1954a]), read,

"For thinking and being are the same."

Heidegger's thought is definitively in Parmenides' line of descent, for it identifies being with language, which is the vehicle of discursive thought (whereas, as we have seen repeatedly, rather than being the same as language, being results from the delusory valuation-absolutization of a subtle / intuitive concept), and identifies both being and language with truth (which is absolutely incorrect, for the former, together with the subject-object duality, is the most basic delusive phenomenon, and the latter is a vehicle for delusion insofar as only the Buddhas can use it without taking what they say to be either true or false). In this respect the views of both Heidegger and Parmenides are contrary to those expressed by Heraclitus and the Madhyamikas, who intended to lead their readers beyond grasping at thought—language being the means of expression of a coarse mode of thought, namely the one the West calls "discursive"—so that the true condition of all reality would be unconcealed in *aletheia*.

[223] In my view, the *logos*, as understood by Heraclitus, is the Gnitive aspect of the Tao as understood by Lao-tzu and other early Taoist masters, and could be viewed *qua* Base, *qua* Path and *qua* Fruit. *Qua* Base, it is the Gnitive and intelligent aspect of Nature (the *physis*, which is neither "physical" nor "mental," for it [is] the true condition of all that appears to be physical and all that appears to be mental), and as such (is) the principle of all awareness and the intelligence that spontaneously regulates all natural occurrences—independently of whether or not this spontaneity is concealed by the manifestation of the delusion that Heraclitus called *lethe* and Shakyamuni called *avidya*, which involves the illusion of separateness, of intentionality, of self-consciousness and so on. *Qua* Path, it is a temporary unveiling of the Tao or *physis* while on the Path (Tao), comprising the temporary disconnection of the illusion of separateness, intentionality, self-consciousness and so on. And *qua* Fruit it is the stabilization and irreversibility of this unveiling upon attaining the Fruit, and as such it involves the definitive eradication of the illusion of separateness, of intentionality, of self-consciousness and so on. Thus whether *qua* Base, *qua* Path or *qua* Fruit, the *logos*—like the Tao—involves spontaneous, natural, unintentional, unselfconscious motility; however, when the *logos* is not manifest either *qua* Path or *qua* Fruit, this spontaneous, unintentional, unselfconscious motility is both distorted and hindered by the illusion of separateness, of intentionality, of self-consciousness and so on. (In fact, the Tao seems to correspond to the *physis*, of which the *logos* is the intelligent or spiritual aspect.)

The Stoics claimed Heraclitus was the source of their conception of the *logos*, which they defined as "the rational order of all things." This school of thought asserted that in the Golden Age human beings spontaneously lived according to the *logos*, and hence there were no exclusive family, no form of property whatsoever, and no state in which some prevailed over others, for such things were in disagreement with the *logos*; however, when the degeneration of humankind gave rise to an order that was no longer based on the *logos*, it was still possible to develop virtue if one managed to develop a life that accorded with universal Reason. Therefore, "spontaneously living according to the *logos*" meant living roughly as an individual in the condition of the *logos* qua Path or of the *logos* qua Fruit would live,

and living in accord with universal Reason means not being in direct contradiction with the principles that may be derived from the behavior of those spontaneously living according to the *logos*. However, the Stoics claimed that this "rational order of all things" was reflected in the three fields of philosophy, which in their view were, (1) *logic* (knowledge, grammar, rhetoric, semantics), (2) *physics* (cosmology, biology, geography, causality, psychology, theology), and (3) *ethics* (the goals, proper functions, moral responsibility, and virtue of human character). Though in the first sense—the rational order of all things as manifest in human beings of the Golden Age and in the workings of the whole of Nature—the Stoics' conception of the *logos* could be deemed to be to a great extent in agreement with that of Heraclitus, in the latter—the *logos* as something that is reflected in knowledge, grammar, rhetoric, semantics, cosmology, biology, geography, causality, psychology, theology, the goals, and moral responsibility—it does not seem to correspond to Heraclitus' *logos*.

[224] This is related to the imprecise assertion by Buddhist philosopher Chandrakirti (universally classified as a Madhyamika Prasangika, even though in his *Madhyamakavatara* he did not use terms such as Prasangika or Swatantrika) that the *dharmata*—the true condition of all dharmas or phenomena—*existed* (Skt. *bhava*). Since there cannot be anything wider or more encompassing than the true condition of all essents, this condition cannot have a *genus proximum*; insofar as there is nothing that this condition excludes, it has no *differentia specifica*; therefore, it cannot be defined, referred to or explained in terms of any concept. According to a long series of Western philosophers ranging from Aristotle to Heidegger, the concept of being is the most general of concepts; therefore, many Western writers have used it to refer to the true condition of all essents. However, though it is true that the concept of being, like the true nature of all essents, has no *genus proximum*, unlike the true nature of all essents the concept of being has a *differentia specifica*, for being can be said not not-to-be (and the same applies to the verb *to exist*, which in this context means *to be*). Since the concept of being has a limit that does not apply to the true nature of all essents, it is utterly absurd to claim, as did Chandrakirti, that the true nature of all essents exists (i.e. that it *is*)—and it is even more absurd to assert that it is self-existent (i.e. that it involves self-being).

Furthermore, the true nature of all essents neither comes into being nor ceases to be; therefore, it is clear that it may not be categorized as either being or nonbeing. In the case of spontaneous awareness, which both the Dzogchen teachings and the Mahamadhyamaka school of Mahayana philosophy compares with the mirror in which all appearances of subject and object arise, the very simile makes it clear that, whereas we experience phenomena as arising and ceasing, this awareness does neither come into being or to cease to be.

[225] Throughout his writings, Heidegger used terms such as *An-Wesenheit*, *An-Stehen*, *Vor-liegen*, *Sich-zeigens*, and *sichdar-stellen*, always involving a hyphen, and having various meanings related to presence, presenting, present and so on.

[226] In Heidegger (1955), p. 416, the German philosopher at some point suggests that non-occultation consists in the occultation of presence, and then says that to this non-occultation, on which non-occultation or *aletheia* is founded, remembrance is directed (and that it remembers what has not passed, because the non-passed remains in all duration, which prolongs the happening of being [with the term "being" crossed out]). However, the occultation of presence is not the same as the dissolution of presence, which is only possible when the subject-object duality dissolves. Furthermore, he says this in the context of a discussion of consummate nihilism.

[227] The idea that being "gives itself" is directly related to Heidegger's crossing out the term being. He writes (Heidegger [1955]; original Ed. p. 410-411): "If the giving belongs to being, and it furthermore does so in such a way that the latter consists in the former, then being dissolves in the giving. This becomes now that which deserves being asked, and which as such being is henceforth thought, which has returned to its essence and fused in it. According to this, the thinking prevision in this ambit may still write being only in the following manner: being (with the word crossed out, as stated in the previous paragraph of the regular text). The erasing in the shape of a cross only comes in an immediate way, that is, from the almost ineradicable habit of representing being as something facing us and existing in itself, and which then only some times meets men. According to this representation is then the appearance as though man were excluded from being. However, not only is he not excluded, that is, not only is he comprehended in being, but being is he who, needing the human essence, is obliged to abandon the appearance of the for-itself and hence it also has a difference essence from that which the representation of a group embracing

the subject-object relation would want to recognize. (...) Man is in his essence the memory of being, but of being (with the word being crossed out). This means: that the human essence belongs to that which in the crossing out of being requires thought as originary imperative." Furthermore (p. 411): Just in the same way as being (with the word crossed out) nothingness would have to be thought..."

[228] As we have seen, Heidegger (1987) noted that the term being has its "appellative force," as it causes us to conceive a particular phenomenon, which is the *phenomenon of being*.

[229] As shown in a note to the preceding chapter, in Heidegger (1988), § 21, p. 443 of original German Ed. the author understood Hegel's identification of being and nothingness as meaning that nothingness is the presence of an absence, and *qua* presence, it is a manifestation of being. However, to say nothingness (or nonbeing, for that matter) is *a manifestation of* being, is not the same as saying being is *identical* with nothingness (or nonbeing, for that matter): if being were *identical* with nothingness and consisted in presence, nothingness could not be the presence of an absence, for insofar as it would have to be identical with the *being* that the presence is, it would have to be this presence itself *in all of its manifestations*, and not only the presence of an absence. Furthermore, both in logical and phenomenological terms, for the presence of an absence to manifest, that which is absent has to be already manifest (or to be implicit *ab initio*, in the sense in which Sartre's *holon* is implicit *ab initio* insofar as all human endeavors aim at it)—which implies the precedence of being in relation to nothingness. However, what Hegel is saying is that at the *initial* stage of dialectic being is *already* identical with nothingness—which is why I agree with Sartre's objection to Hegel's identification of being with nothingness discussed in the aforementioned note.

As we have seen, it is correct to say that nonbeing is the presence of the absence of being, which is sustained by the phenomenon of being, to which it therefore refers and which it asserts—and which, besides, it reveals through its absence. However, to say that nonbeing is the presence of the absence of being, that this presence of an absence is sustained by the phenomenon of being, and that hence nonbeing refers to being and asserts being, is utterly different from saying being is *identical with* nonbeing: in fact, the condition of possibility of making all of these assertions is that nonbeing be different from being, for otherwise we would be saying that "being is the presence of the absence of being"—which would be contradictory—and that "being refers to being and asserts being"—which would be a most stupid truism and tautology. Furthermore, Hegel's explanations absolutely exclude this interpretation—which, in particular, for the reasons expressed in the above paragraph, is incompatible with the assertion that at the initial stage of the dialectical process being is identical with nothingness.

The point is that, if concepts were identical to their contraries, thinking itself would be impossible.

[230] Once more, since the *arche* has neither *genus proximum* nor *differentia specifica*, identifying being with it would amount to depriving this concept of *genus proximum* and *differentia specifica*, and thus making it become like the conception of being Hegel (1990) expressed at the beginning of the *Logic*, according to which it was identical with nothingness. This would have deprived the concept of being of its content, turning it into an empty concept. Since, thus conceived, being could not have what Heidegger called its "appellative force," it would no longer refer to any phenomenon—and yet, as we have seen repeatedly, in *Einführung in die Metaphysik*, which expresses Heidegger's final view in this regard, he stressed precisely its "appellative force." The only way in which being, conceived *à la hégélienne*, could have an "appellative force," would have been if Hegel's nothingness were the presence of an absence, and presence were what Hegel understood by being—which may have been Heidegger's idea, but which was refuted in the preceding note.

[231] Here Reason is understood in a sense much wider that Kant's: not only does it include Reason, the Capacity of Judgment, the Understanding, and Sensibility, but it is understood in what could be called "a cosmic sense." Thought Reason thus understood has nothing to do with Heraclitus' *logos*, Hegel believed it to be Heraclitus' *logos*.

Though in the *Phenomenology of Mind* (Hegel [1955]) the term Reason refers to a stage of development of Spirit that begins with the development of self-consciousness, in the *Introduction to the Philosophy of History* (Hegel [1988]) he used the term in a far more general sense, which seems to be a synonym of *Geist* in the *Phenomenology* and in the *Science of Logic* (Hegel [1990]), and of the absolute idea in some passages of the *Encyclopedia* (Hegel [1991]).

In the *Introduction to the Philosophy of History* Hegel claimed that "Reason rules the world;" that world history has therefore been rational in its course; that Reason is for itself the *infinite material* of all natural and spiritual life and the *substance* in the sense that it is that whereby and wherein all reality has its being

and subsistence, but also the *infinite power*; that Reason lives on itself, and it is itself the material upon which it works; that the immutable laws of nature are its Reason, for Nature [is] an organic whole brought forth by Reason—and that the time must finally come when we comprehend the rich product of creative Reason that is world history.

[232] This in its turn is related to Hegel's assertion in *The Philosophy of Right* (Hegel [1968]), in the context of the discussion of the relation between the evolution of the State and that of reason, that all that is real is rational and all that is rational is real. Though Hegel made this assertion in order to justify the Prussian State of his time and all preceding manifestations of the State, in view of the terminology he used in the *Introduction to the Philosophy of History* (Hegel [1988]) the assertion may be validly extended to Hegel's view concerning the whole of reality.

[233] Sartre's objection to Hegel's conception of being may be related to the *Principia Mathematica* by Russell & Whitehead (1910-1913), in terms of which we may say that by making being, at the beginning of the *Logic*, be identical with nothingness, unless this term had been explicitly asserted to have the sense of no-thing-ness (in which case the assertion would be correct, for being is not a thing), Hegel incurred in what Russell & Whitehead would call a confusion of logical types, for the fact that, due to its lack of determinations (other than its contrast with nonbeing that makes it be being), being cannot be an essent (so that it is non-essent or no-thing-ness), does not at all imply that it may be asserted to be nonbeing, asserted to be nothingness without qualifying this term, or asserted to be nothingness-of-being—which would be nonsense insofar as then being and nonbeing would be identical and neither concept would have any content whatsoever. This confusion causes Hegel's being to lack a phenomenological content and not to correspond to the phenomenon of being elicited by being's "appellative force," but, insofar as it lacks something other with regard to itself by *differentia specifica* with which it may be defined, be a chimera empty of content.

[234] Ever since Nagarjuna and his disciple Aryadeva founded the Madhyamaka School of Buddhist philosophy, all Madhyamikas have agreed that all essents are empty of self-being (Skt. *swabhava-shunyata*). Then, when the Madhyamaka School subdivided, the "outer, coarse Madhyamaka" (Tib. Chi ragpai uma [*phyi rags pa'i dbu ma*])—consisting in the Madhyamaka Rangtongpa schools, which are the Prasangika subschool and the various Swatantrika subschools—accepted only the concept of voidness as emptiness of self-being, whereas the inner, subtle Madhyamaka (Tib. Nang trawai uma [*nang phra ba'i dbu ma*]), consisting of the Uma Zhentongpa (*dbu ma gzhan stong pa*) and Mahamadhyamaka (Tib. Uma Chenmo [*dbu ma chen mo*]) schools, accepted both the concept of voidness as emptiness of self-being and the zhentong (*gzhan stong*) concept of voidness, which is that of zhengyi ngöpo tongpanyi (*gzhan gyi dngos po stong pa nyid*; Skt. *paravastushunyata*?) or "absence of substances other than the single true condition of all reality." The essential views of these schools were briefly summarized in previous chapters and their notes; for a thorough review of them, cf. the upcoming version in print of Capriles (2004).

[235] Cf. the preceding note.

[236] The negation of being *qua* actuality may imply either lack of manifestation (as in the Christian conception of the nothingness that prevailed before the God created the world *ex-nihilo*, or in the Platonic sense of the eternal formless matter that at some point the Demiurge infuses with form, or in the sense of there being as yet no manifestation of the phenomena of the thukje [*thugs rje*] aspect of the Base posited by the Dzogchen teachings), or the lack of actuality of what seems to be actual (as in the case of hallucinations, mirages and so on). In all of these cases, nothingness *qua* negation of being *qua* actuality is mutually exclusive with being *qua* actuality.

On the other hand, the *negation* of being *qua* the illusion of self-being, which *is in all cases sustained by the phenomenon of being that gives rise to the illusion of self-being*, might be either an *interpretation* of the content of all experiences of derealization (independently of whether these are unwanted psychotic experiences, or wanted experiences occurring in the context of the practice of a Path of Awakening—such as, for example, the experience called the "mass of doubt," which manifests in koan study in Rinzai Zen), or merely intellectual negations that secondary process carries out in specific Buddhist practices not involving all out experiences of derealization (such as the ones that manifest in the practices of insight [Pali, *vipassana*; Skt. *vipashyana*; Tib. lhantong / *lhag mthong*; Chinese, *kuan*] taught in the *Samdhinirmochanasutra* and the texts based on this *Sutra* considered in the preceding chapter). In fact, only absolute voidness as it manifests in the Contemplation state of the third and fourth bodhisattva paths, and in a continuous manner in the fifth bodhisattva path, may be said to be nothingness *qua lack of*

the illusion of self-being—and, as such, neither is it sustained by the phenomenon of being, nor does it involve negation (which is why it is not precise to refer to it as voidness).

[237] When Lao-tzu wrote that what *is* arises from nothingness (*wu*), he was *not* saying that the phenomena we experience as *being* arise *ex nihilo* from absence of matter, from darkness or from an amorphous matter like the one conceived by Plato—and therefore his statement does not seem to contradict Parmenides' *ex nihilo nihil fit* (which is not to say that Lao-tzu's thinking is connected with that of the Eleatics: as clearly stated in a previous note, Lao-tzu's tradition seems to be connected with that of Heraclitus by means of Mount Kailash, and as such it seems to be in contradiction with that of Parmenides). What he is saying is that all essents manifest through the no-thing-ness (*wu*) of the Tao, which, as we have seen, in this sense is roughly the same as the ngowo (*ngo bo*) or essence aspect of the Base in the Dzogchen teachings.

In Chapter I, we saw that the Dzogchen teachings compare the Base with a mirror. The essence or ngowo (*ngo bo*) aspect of the Base, which is emptiness, is represented by the emptiness of the mirror, which is the fact that insofar as the mirror does not bear any fixed image it may fill itself with any image whatsoever. The nature or rangzhin (*rang bzhin*) aspect of the Base is compared with the mirror's reflectiveness, which is the quality that makes it never to stop manifesting images. And the energy or thukje (*thugs rje*) aspect of the Base is compared to the succession of images in the mirror and these images themselves (in a previous note I discuss an important objection to this view). This means that all the phenomena of the energy of thukje aspect of the Base manifest as a function of the nature or rangzhin aspect of the Base, *through the essence or ngowo aspect of the Base*, *which is emptiness*—which seems to be precisely what Lao-tzu was saying when he claimed that all that *is* arises from nothingness (*wu*).

[238] As it is clear after the explanation given above in the regular text of this chapter and the one given in a previous note, no-thing-ness in the sense of *wu* or *mu* (is) not a negation. Whereas negations are carried out *a posteriori* on something that is already manifest, *wu* or *mu* is the total openness of our original condition, which allows everything to manifest.

On the contrary, the Madhyamikas agree in linking emptiness *qua k'ung* or *ku* (Skt. *swabhava shunyata*; Tib. rangzhinggyi tongpanyi [*rang bzhing gyis stong pa nyid*] to negation: the Shantarakshita-Kamalashila-Arya Vimuktasena branch of Madhyamaka-Swatantrika-Yogachara regards emptiness as an affirming or implicative negation (Skt. *paryudasapratisedha*; Tib. mayingag [*ma yin dgag*]), whereas the Madhyamaka-Prasangika links it to nonaffirming or absolute negation (Skt. *prasajyapratisedha*: Tib. megag [*med dgag*]). The paradigmatic instance of nonaffirming or absolute negation of the Prasangikas or "Thoroughly Nonabiding Madhyamikas" (Skt. *sarvadharmapratisthanavadin*; Tib. rabtu minepar mawa [*rab tu mi gnas par smra ba*]), was the *chatushkoti* or "negation by the same stroke of the four extremes concerning a topic" (i.e. the simultaneous negation of nonbeing, not-nonbeing, both-being-and-nonbeing and neither-being-nor-nonbeing), which was intended to prevent the delusory valuation of any concept, and which, when successful, resulted in the disconnection of the mind, the phenomenon of being and the subject-object duality. Though this disconnection does not necessarily involve the manifestation of absolute truth as understood by the Madhyamaka Prasangika, it is a condition of possibility for the manifestation of this truth.

Je Tsongkhapa, however, radically reformed the Madhyamaka Prasangika, replacing the original method of this school by that of the Shantarakshita-Kamalashila-Arya Vimuktasena branch of Madhyamaka-Swatantrika-Yogachara, which he modified so that it would seem to agree with the basic tenets of Prasangika, and reinterpreting the ensuing voidness, which manifested as object to a subject and was *not* the one sought by the Prasangika, in terms that in his view agreed with Prasangika philosophy—so that the voidness in question could be said to be a nonaffirming or absolute negation rather than an affirming or implicative negation. However, Gendün Chöphel objected that the negation in question had the defect of nonattributive negation: the presence of the absence of the [mode of] being we wrongly attributed to the object of analysis manifests, but all that accompanies the object (for example, the location where it is manifesting) continues to be experienced as involving [self-]being. Furthermore, even the voidness consisting in the presence of the absence of the [mode of] being we wrongly attributed to the object of analysis is experienced as involving [self-]being, and as such, it is a manifestation of delusion. This is evident from the fact that, according to Tsongkhapa, the voidness in question manifests as object to a subject: the subject object duality always goes along with the illusion of [self-]being, for both of them result from the delusory valuation of the threefold thought structure, and hence it is impossible that the subject-object may manifest without subject and object appearing to involve self-being—or, what it the

same, that the duality in question arises without involving delusion. As will be shown in Part II, Chapter VIII of this book, some of the most important canonical sources and their interpreters corroborate the fact that the subject-object duality is a pivotal manifestation of basic human delusion to be surpassed (cf. Madhyamika philosopher Aryadeva, *Chatuhishatakashastrakarika* XIV.25; Prasangika philosopher Shantideva, *Bodhicharyavatara* IX.2; etc.). Therefore, the most controversial point in Tsongkhapa's system is the fact that he identifies this delusive voidness as the absolute truth of the Prasangikas. For a thorough discussion of Tsongkhapa's philosophy, cf. Capriles (2005) and the upcoming definitive version in print of Capriles (2004).

The above does not mean absolute truth has nothing to do with negation. As stated in previous notes, *before* absolute truth initially manifests, an all out derealization may occur which involves subject-object duality and in which the presence of the absence of [self-]being is sustained by the phenomenon of being. In the gradual Mahayana this incipient intuition of voidness may take place in the second bodhisattva path, called path of preparation or path of application (Skt. *prayogamarga*; Tib. jorlam [*sbyor-lam*]), and as such is clearly distinguished from the absolute truth, which only occurs upon transition to the third bodhisattva path: the path of Vision (Skt. *darshanamarga*; Tib. tonglam [*mthong lam*]).

[239] Heidegger viewed this experience of nothingness and the anguish that revealed it as being originary and fundamental, and as representing authenticity itself (in contrast with unauthenticity, consisting in ignoring basic anguish through immersing oneself in the essent). He wrote (Heidegger [1929], p. 116):

"...nothingness cloaks itself from us in its originariness. But in what way or through what? Well, through the fact that we in some way lose ourselves completely in the essent."

He also wrote:

"The fact that the *Dasein* be completely traversed by a behavior that consists in desisting attests to the permanent manifest character, though of course darkened, of nothingness, which originarily only discloses itself in anguish. But this signifies that the originary anguish is usually kept repressed in the *Dasein*. The anguish is here. It is just that it is drowsy. Its breath vibrates permanently going through the whole of the *Dasein*..."

[240] Saviani (2004), p. 45, cites this passage from Heidegger (1938), p. 104, as an example of the alleged usage by Heidegger of Eastern conceptions of nothingness or voidness (Saviani gives the reference wrongly as p. 113 of GA 5, *Holzwege*). In pp. 42-49, Saviani wrongly interprets other statements by Heidegger in terms of Eastern concepts of nothingness or voidness, and again in pp. 75, 77, and 89 of Saviani's book there are further similar misinterpretations by Saviani and others. Many authors have interpreted Heidegger's *nichtendes Nichts* in this way.

[241] As shown in the preceding chapter, this does not apply to Tsongkhapa's reinterpretation of Prasangika Madhyamaka, according to which absolute truth is voidness manifesting as an object to a mental subject.

[242] Heidegger also writes (Heidegger [1929], p. 118):

"What turns man into the deputy (or lieutenant) of nothingness is the fact that the *Dasein* is immersed in nothingness on the foundation of concealed anguish. So finite we are, that precisely we are not capable of moving originarily in face of nothingness through a decision and will of our own. So abysmally does it deepens and undermines finiteness (*Verendlichtung*) in the *Dasein*, that our freedom is denied the most proper and profound finitude (*Endlichkeit*)."

This confirms both the fact that this anguish is a most basic manifestation of delusion, and the fact that *Was ist Metaphysik* must be classified as pertaining to *Existenzphilosophie*.

[243] Heidegger writes (Heidegger [1929], p. 118):

"But all this only occurs as a result of that for which [it] squanders [itself], with the aim of preserving the last greatness of the *Dasein*."

[244] Sartre defined anguish as fear, not of whatever unwanted occurrences may happen to us, but of the unwanted consequences *of our own decisions and actions*. It may be assumed that this does not require that we should be entertaining and consciously focusing on *specific* unwanted consequences of our actions.

[245] In order to judge, first there has to arise the spurious subject-object duality. Except when we remain in the *arupa loka*, *arupyadhatu* or formless realm, the following step is always the division into figure and ground of the continuum of what appears as object. After this, the figure is understood in terms of a concept. In the case of judgments of taste (including aesthetic judgments), moral judgments and so on, at this point the object will be judged positively, as a result of which we will accept it; negatively, as a result of which we will reject it; or neutrally, as a result of which we will remain indifferent toward it. As

shown in the first chapter of this book, what makes our sensations positive, negative or neutral is our attitude toward them; since we can entertain only one attitude at a time, and since our attitude affects the whole of the continuum of what may appear as object, including the sensations in our own bodies, the so-called mental sensation or feeling tone (Skt. *vedana*; Tib. tsorwa [*tshor ba*]) that we experience in the center of our body at the level of the heart and that we take to be the sign of the objective aesthetic or moral quality of the object of perception, will become pleasant if the object is accepted, unpleasant if the object is rejected, and neutral if we remain indifferent toward the object. This is why upon admiring an art form, a landscape and so on, we experience "mental pleasure"—which then we take to be the proof of the objective beauty of the object of our judgment, despite the fact that it resulted from our acceptance and would be experienced just the same were we able to admire a turd. And, upon censuring the deeds of a criminal, we experience an unpleasant sensation, which we take to be the proof of the reprehensible character of the deeds in question and of the one responsible for them.

The fact that our feelings before objects of aesthetic appreciation, rather than being a proof of objective beauty, ugliness and so on, depend on our attitude, is evidenced by the fact that, if we are forced to contemplate uninterruptedly *a work of art we like*, even if initially we experience aesthetic pleasure, after some time our mental sensation or feeling tone will become neutral—and at some point we will interpret the continuity of this neutral feeling as boredom and reject it, thus making it become unpleasant.

[246] The third path of the gradual Mahayana, called the path of Vision (Skt. *darshanamarga*; Tib. thong lam [*mthong lam*]), corresponds to the first bodhisattva level (Skt. *bhumi*; Tib. *sa*), called "the joyous" (Skt. *pramudita*; Tib. rabtu ganwa [*rab tu dga' ba*]). The fourth path of the gradual Mahayana, called the path of Contemplation (Skt. *dhyanamarga*; Tib. gom lam [*sgom lam*]) encompasses all levels from the second to the tenth. Finally, the fifth path of the gradual Mahayana, called the path of No-more-learning (Skt. *ashaikshamarga*; Tib. milobpai lam [*mi slob pa'i lam*], corresponds to the eleventh level, called "all-pervading light" (Skt. *samantaprabha*; Tib. kuntu ö [*kun tu 'od*]). (This is the explanation in terms of eleven levels; the correspondence of paths and levels is different in those texts that list only ten levels.)

[247] The second Mahayana path is the path of preparation or path of application (Skt. *prayogamarga*; Tib. jorwe lam [*sbyor ba'i lam*]); the third stage of this path is the one called "tolerance (Skt. *kshanti*; Tib. zöpa [*bzod pa*]) of birthlessness," at which the bodhisattva overcomes the fear of voidness that bars access to the third Mahayana path, which is that of Vision [(of) ultimate truth] (Skt. *darshana marga*; Tib. tonglam [*mthong lam*]).

[248] In terms of the gradual Mahayana, it would have the possibility of manifesting until the very end of the fourth Mahayana path / tenth bodhisattva level, for it is only in the fifth Mahayana path / eleventh bodhisattva level that there is no longer a Contemplation and a post-Contemplation state, as delusion can no longer occur.

[249] Immediately before the excerpt to which the reference mark to this note was appended, in terms that prefigure Sartre's explanation of the manifestation of lacks as the presence of an absence, we read in this text by Heidegger (1988, § 20, p. 311, original German Edition p. 443):

"Missing, however, is also not just the uncovering of the non-handy but an explicit enpresenting of what is precisely already and at least still handy. The absential modification, precisely, of the praesens belonging to the enpresenting of commerce [with the handy], the praesens being given with the missing, is what makes the handy become conspicuous. With this a fundamental but difficult problem lays claim to our attention. When we formally call the ab-sential a negation of the praesensial, may it not be, exactly, that a negative moment is constituting itself in the structure of the being of the handy, that is, primarily in handiness? In fundamental terms, to what extent is a negative, a not, involved in Temporality in general and, conjointly, in temporality? We may even inquire to what extent time itself is the condition of possibility of nullity in general. Because the modification of praesens into absens, of presence into absence—a modification belonging to temporality (to the ek-stasis of the present as well as to the other ek-stases)—has the character of negativity, of the not, of not-presencing, the question arises as to where in general the root of this not lies. Closer consideration shows that the not and also the essential nature of the not, nullity, likewise can be interpreted only by way of the nature of time and that it is only by starting from this that the possibility of modification—for example, the modification of presence into absence—can be explained."

[250] However, it is likely that, by saying that being cannot be known as object, Heidegger may have been trying to express an idea radically different from the one I am referring to, for the fact that he failed to realize

that in each and every moment of the experience of the *nichtendes Nichts* there was an object makes me doubt that he really understood what "there being an object" meant.

[251] A key error involved in this approach of Heidegger's is that it would amount to remaining within the realm of [delusorily valued-absolutized] conceptuality and yet renouncing the logic that rules this realm—which implies renouncing the critical function of secondary process that, once delusion has developed to a certain extent, is indispensable for curbing (at least to a certain extent) the drive to treat other human beings and the natural environment instrumentally. In fact, the deeds of Nazism show that remaining within the sphere of delusorily valued-absolutized conceptuality and yet doing away with the critical function proper of secondary process rationality can not only give rise to the most wicked totalitarianism and belligerence, but go as far as to produce something as terrible as the holocaust. In Heidegger's case, it allowed him to actively support and promote the Führer, the Nazi party, and their policies.

However, to say that once delusion and instrumentality have developed to a certain extent, the critical function of secondary process is necessary to contain their most immediately destructive effects, is not to say that the solution for the present predicament of humankind lies in perfecting the critical function in question: presently delusion and instrumentality have reached dimensions comparable to those of the great fire at the end of the time cycle (Skt. *kalpa*; Greek, *aion*), and the critical function of secondary process is as powerless to contain them as the waterspout of a household hosepipe would be for containing the great fire in question. The development of the basic human delusion during human evolution and history gave rise to the instrumental structuring of the human psyche that makes us perceive the natural environment, other human beings, and to a great extent our own bodies, as aspects of an alien environment in which we have been "thrown" against our will (the "thrownness" Heidegger described in *Being and Time*), and which we have to tame, control and exploit in order to have a secure, virtuous and comfortable life—a goal we have tried to achieve by developing ever more powerful technological means. Thus we gave rise to the ecological crisis which threatens the continuity of human society and the survival of the human species and of all life on our planet, and which is the deadly contradiction that proves delusion and instrumentality to have completed their *reductio ad absurdum*. Therefore, at this point there is no way back: either delusion is eradicated, and as a result the instrumentality begotten by the development of delusion is uprooted, or we will destroy not only the fabric of society, but the web of life of which humankind is but a thread. Since the only effective means for eradicating delusion are the most effective time-proven Paths of Awakening, our very survival depend on the availability and dissemination of these Paths.

Heidegger's project, which failed to identify the basic human delusion that combines a narrow focus of awareness with the delusory valuation of thought, which cherished and identified as truth itself that most basic manifestation of delusion which is the phenomenon of being, and which did not openly acknowledge the central function of time-proven Paths of Awakening (of which Heidegger lacked transmission) in eradicating human delusion, is powerless to contain the ecological Armageddon. Although it pretends to do away with the scientific attitude and language that in his view constitute reality as object, and with the attitude and technical language that modify reality in order to profit from it, it fails to note that delusion and the relationships and institutions that developed with it must be eradicated if our species is to survive and primordial harmony is to be restored. Though it is true that to install oneself in a clearing (*Lichtung*) in the woods in the midst of paths leading nowhere, is far less destructive of the ecosystem than carrying on with the frenzied development of technology, being is a most basic phenomenon of delusion, and to inhabit it or to sing it in poetical language is no remedy for the evils we face. The basic delusion called *avidya* or *lethe* must be surpassed, so that we rid ourselves of the delusory valuation of thought and the narrow/hermetic focus of awareness that together cause us to fail to grasp interdependencies, of the belief that we are substantial egos and the concomitant feeling of being the center of the universe, and of the subject-object duality and the phenomenon of being—all of which are at the root of political and economical inequalities, of the exploitation of other human beings and the rest of nature, and of the disruption of the ecosphere.

The fact that Heidegger actively supported and promoted the Führer, the Nazi party and their policies, pinnacle of the malignant relationships and institutions that developed through the exacerbation of delusion, attest to the parallel between the project of the German philosopher and that of the "Traditional movement" (involving René Guénon, spiritualist Nazi ideologist Julius Evola, Eastern aesthetics and art expert Ananda Coomaraswamy, Fritjhof Schoun, Martin Lings and others) which will be considered in Part III of this book and which aims at restoring an elitist spiritual-political hierarchy corresponding to a

supposedly previous stage in the process of social and spiritual degenerative evolution (were such a spiritual-political regress possible, the basic state of mind, the basic propensities and the basic institutions at the root of the present crisis would be conserved, and we would have to continuously be trying to prevent them from re-developing their present fruits—which, however, would be impossible).

Among the various tendencies that in the late 1970s and very early 1980s competed in the bosom of the German Green Party, there were, among others, a "progressive" one constituted by ex-militants of the Left and ex-hippies who aspired to surpass all the institutions that developed in the process of evolution of human delusion, and a "reactionary" one composed of conservative peasants and of Romantic—often ex-Nazi—followers of Heidegger who pined for ways of life previous to those that resulted from the most drastic developments of technological civilization, but who clung to values and institutions proper of the late stages of the time cycle of human spiritual and social degeneration. In 1982, the more right-wing elements of the party broke away to form the Ecological Democratic Party. However, this did not represent the victory of its more revolutionary wing, for later on in the same decade a so to say pragmatic wing of the party gained control over it—and then in the late 1990s the Green Party formed the first of its two coalition governments with the Social Democratic Party (SPD), which deprived it of its political ideals and contents.

[252] In Capriles (2004), I pointed to another similar error in Guenther (1977), pp. 142-147, which among other works contains the translation of the *rdzogs pa chen po'i gnad gsum shan 'byed*, a terma (*gter ma*) revealed by Jigme Lingpa that is part of the *klong chen snying gi thig le*. After adapting the terminology to the one used throughout this book, the warning we are concerned with, which appears in p. 144, reads:

"Those who do not understand it in this way and take the base-of-all for the *dharmakaya* are like blind men without a guide, erring about in a desert. As they are deluded about the nature of the Base and the Fruit, the Path by which Buddhahood can be realized in one lifetime has been blocked. *Samaya*."

The objections I make concern the translation of the Sanskrit term *dharmakaya* and the Tibetan chöku (*chos sku*) as "decisive existence," which expresses an idea that could hardly be more different to the meaning of the words it translated. To begin with, the *dharmakaya* (is) *beyond existence*. In fact, if we understand the term "existence" in the sense of "being," then it must be objected, not only that the nondual, unthinkable *dharmakaya* (is) beyond being and nonbeing, but also that, insofar as the manifestation of the *dharmakaya* puts an end to delusion, it involves the dissolution of that most basic instance of delusion that is the *phenomenon of being*. Furthermore, if, following Heidegger, we understand the term "existence" in terms of its etymology, which is "standing outside self," the conclusion is the same, for the *dharmakaya* is *the very surpassing of the illusion of divisiveness and lack of wholeness*.

To say that the *dharmakaya* is "decisive" is equally wrong. In fact, in the Webster Collegiate Dictionary we are offered three meanings of this term, the first two being: (1) "having the power or quality of deciding" and (2) "resolute, determined." Neither applies to the *dharmakaya*, which is beyond the possibility of decision insofar as it is beyond judgment, beyond the subject-object duality, and beyond intentionality. The third meaning of the term is (3) "unmistakable, unquestionable:" if this adjective were used to qualify the noun "existence," which, as shown above, refers to basic delusion, then the meaning of the phrase would be that of "unmistakable, unquestionable basic delusion."

I object not only to the above translation of the term *dharmakaya*, but even to the attempt to render it in terms of a Western word or phrase. The reason is that the term *dharmakaya* has so many different meanings according to the context in which it is used, that any translation will necessarily do away with all but one of its manifold meanings. This is the reason why the Tibetans who produced the ancient translations, who in general rendered the words in terms of their deeper meanings rather than in terms of their etymology, in this case kept faithful to the etymology of the Sanskrit term and coined the term chöku (*chos sku*): chö (*chos*) was the literal translation of *dharma*, and ku (*sku*) was the literal translation of *kaya*. Unlike the Tibetans, Dr Guenther totally disregarded the etymology of the term he was translating, and, rather than finding a translation that conveyed at least one the deeper meanings of the word, used one that fails to convey all of its meanings. Paradoxically, in Guenther, Herbert, 1977, p. 190, note 22, the author criticizes those who leave the term untranslated, and offers us a translation of the particle *kaya* or ku (*sku*) that contradicts all of its legitimate meanings. He writes:

"…*chos sku*. This term corresponds to (the) Sanskrit *dharmakaya*, which is either left untranslated or mistranslated by what I call the 'literalist fallacy'. The Tibetan term *sku* indicates 'existence' in the sense of 'Being'. It almost approximates the existentialist philosopher's conception of 'existence' and 'Being' except that it does not share the latter's subjectivism."

In other words, Dr Guenther wrongly believed the Tibetan term ku (*sku*) to express what existentialism and *Existenzphilosophie* called "existence;" however, what these systems referred to by this term was what Sartre called being-for-Self (*être-pour-Soi*) and what Heidegger referred to as *Dasein*: the former is the being of the human individual that, feeling incomplete, is always striving to attain the wholeness and self-sameness of the *dharmakaya*, while at the same time striving to maintain it own illusory existence; the latter, as shown in the regular text, is human existence that believes itself separate and finite. Since the creators of existentialism and *Existenzphilosophie* never went beyond *samsara*, they were referring to the being of the human entity in a dualistic context that in Buddhist terms pertains to *samsara*. However, the term ku is used solely in the framework of *nirvana*, and as such is contrasted with lü (*lus*), which applies only in the context of *samsara*.

[253] To my knowledge, the first time Heidegger used this term was in the Introduction to his course of the Summer Semester of 1927 in Marburg, in a passage transcribed in p. 22 of the original German edition of Heidegger (1988). At that point, Heidegger explained the "ontological difference" as the separation between being and essent. He undertook an in-depth discussion of this difference in the Second Part of the same book (pp. 227-330 [Original German Ed. pp. 322-469), and in particular in § 22 (pp. 318-330 [Original German Ed. pp. 452-469]). In the same work, he also employed the term to refer to the difference between the mode of existence of the *Dasein* and the mode of being of available essents (p. 176; Original German Ed. p. 250). However, below in the regular text it will be shown that in some of Heidegger's later works (in particular in Was heisst Denken and in Identität und Differenz) the *ontological difference* is not exactly a contrast between the ontic and the ontological (or, far less, a distinction between the mode of existence of the *Dasein* and the mode of being of available essents).

Furthermore, also in Heidegger (1975), Introduction, § 5, pp. 21-22 (Original German Ed. pp. 28-29) the German author redefined Husserl's "phenomenological reduction," making it become the same as the "ontological difference" *qua* the difference between essent and being—or, more precisely, between the ontic understanding of an essent's being and the ontological understanding of it.

[254] "Noetic" refers to all that has to do with the noesis or act of knowledge and the mental subject that seems to be the knower. In its turn, "noematic" refers to that which appears as object *within the Gnitive continuum of an individual*.

[255] Here Heidegger is understanding the term "unconcealed" in a limited, definitely wrong acceptation, which as will be shown below in the regular text of this chapter is contrary to the true meaning of Heraclitus' *aletheia* (even though Heidegger wrongly believes it to correspond to it).

[256] A partial exception to this may be the case of individuals going through psychotic derealization.

[257] According to Heidegger, the "step back" (*Schritt zurück*) allowed the potency of "installing" (*stellen*) to attain a "frontal opening" (*Entgegen*) without becoming an object (*Gegenstand*), and led to an awareness of the fact that Being does possess a giving, granting, and bestowing quality (thereby offering the possibility of overcoming metaphysics and inauthentic nihilism). In Heidegger's view, it was imperative to take this step back as an alternative to commissioning and contemplating the technical world.

[258] Kant posited a given, nonphenomenal, undivided reality involving neither space nor time that he called *Ding-an-sich* or *thing-in-itself*, and asserted that corporeal (i.e. spatial), concrete essents manifest in our experience when *the psyche* structures the *Ding-an-sich* or *thing-in-itself* in terms of the *a priori* forms of Sensibility: the *outer sense*, corresponding to space, and the *inner sense*, which is time. What Kant called phenomena are the corporeal (i.e. spatial), concrete essents we experience, which in terms of the Dzogchen teachings are manifestations of tsel (*rtsal*) energy. As shown in one of the first notes to the preceding chapter, since the *phenomenon of being* is not a concrete essent of tsel energy, it may not be said to be a phenomenon in the Kantian sense of the term, and since it is not an essence resulting from the phenomenological reduction, it is not a phenomenon in Husserl's sense either. It is a phenomenon *in the general sense of being something that appears*.

Kant divided the psyche into separate, autonomous compartments: (1) Sensibility; (2) the Understanding; (3) the Capacity of Judgment, and (4) Reason. The thoughts that worked in the first of these spheres were called *intuitions*; the ones that worked in the second were called *concepts*; the ones in the third were called *judgments* (which could be of taste, or teleological), and the ones working in the fourth, according to their character, could be either *ideas* or *ideals*. In an attempt to validate his own experience and the idiosyncrasies of his society, in each of the compartments he drew within the human psyche Kant posited *a priori* elements: the existence of *a priori* forms of Sensibility was supposed to confirm the objective, true existence of the world and of human experience in general; the existence of *a priori* concepts of the

Understanding was supposed to validate the knowledge—scientific and nonscientific—that prevailed in his society, justifying its claim to truth; the existence of *a priori* aesthetic judgments in the Faculty of Judgment (judgments of taste *other* than those involved in aesthetic appreciation, such as "nice, it has pepper" or "awful, they put vinegar," rather than being *a priori*, depended on individual preferences) was supposed to validate his society's tastes as the objective appreciation of universal beauty, whereas the *a priori* teleological judgments in the Faculty of Judgment would explain and to some extent justify the views of Christianity; the existence of *a priori* ideas and ideals in Reason was supposed to support the claim to universality of the morality and ethics of his own society.

However, the above would not work in the light of the Indian myth of *lila*—or of the philosophy of Heraclitus, for that matter (as we have seen, according to fr. 123 DK, the *logos*/*physis* likes to hide; according to fr. 2 DK, though the *logos* is common to all, each and every individual believes he or she has a separate, particular and private intellect of his or her own; according to fr. 50 DK, those who listen, not to "me" but to the *logos*, wisely acknowledge that all is one; according to Fr. B 52 DK, the cosmic time cycle [*Aion*] is the checkers-playing child to whom [real] kingship belongs). In fact, if the sense of human life lies in becoming deluded, confused and lost through the delusory valuation-absolutization of thought in the process of growing up and being socialized, so that in a subsequent stage of life our true nature may be rediscovered, any *a priori* thought in the human psyche would have to be a raw material that upon being delusorily valued-absolutized will beget delusion, error, and confusion—rather than being a source and a guarantee of truth, beauty, and so on. Of course *lila* is but a myth; however, the "hard" sciences strongly support the ancient vision of the universe as an undivided continuum (including both what we regard as its mental aspects and what we view as its physical aspects), and the general trend among philosophers who base themselves on the sciences consist in admitting separateness and multiplicity to be but an illusion. Since there can be no source of cognition other than Universal Gnitiveness, the myth of *lila* is right in representing the illusion of separateness and multiplicity as a function of Universal Gnitiveness, which upon manifesting as individual, limited, dualistic, thetic, positional human consciousness becomes unaware of the fact that it is Universal Gnitiveness, and believes itself to be a separate, autonomous creature in a world of multiplicity. Therefore, there are grounds for claiming that any *a priori* elements that may determine human experience must be partly responsible for this delusion.

Heidegger never asserted being to be an *a priori* element in a compartment of the human psyche. However, just as in the light of the myth of *lila* and of Heraclitus' philosophy the Kantian thesis that intuitions, concepts, judgments and ideas-ideals were *a priori* implies that they are sources of error and confusion, in the light of the myth of *lila* and of Heraclitus' philosophy Heidegger's thesis that being is *a priori* implies that it is a source of error and delusion. And, in fact, the super-subtle thought structure called the "threefold thought structure" is *a priori* in Kant's sense, and the *phenomenon of being* and the subject-object duality that result from its delusory valuation-absolutization are the two most basic deceptive appearances of *samsara*. (This implies that being does not depend on Kantian existence-nonexistence categories of modality lying in an "Understanding," and that the appearance that the essents that Heidegger called innerworldly *are in themselves*, which arises when—in his own words—those essents manifest as reality, does not depend on Kantian substance-accident categories of relation.)

[259] The metaontological difference is the one that arises from contrasting: (a) the experiences colored and conditioned by the *phenomenon of being* (independently of whether or not this phenomenon may be obscured by the experience of essents), and (b) the naked unveiling of the *physis* once the veil involving the *phenomenon of being* and the subject-object duality has fallen. The unveiling indicated by (b) is like an Awakening that allows us to see the experience colored and conditioned by the *phenomenon of being* and the subject-object duality (independently of whether this experience is characterized by an ontic understanding of being or by a pseudo-ontological one) to have been like a dream. This difference is discussed in detail in Capriles (work in progress 3); it is dealt with in lesser depth in Capriles (undated).

[260] This, to which reference was made in the preceding chapter of this book, is often explained in terms of the spontaneous process the Dzogchen teachings represent with the *mandala* (cf. Capriles [2000a, 2000b, 2000c).

[261] Concerning the alleged identity of the Buddha-nature of the Mahayana and the Base of Dzogchen, it must be noted that whereas most Mahayana teachings view the Buddha-nature (*tathagatagarbha*, *buddhata*, *bhutatathata*) as a potentiality and compare it to a seed that must develop into the tree of Buddhahood by means of contributory conditions, in the Dzogchen teachings the Base consists in fully actual

Buddhahood—which, however, sentient beings in *samsara* fail to realize and, on the contrary, apprehend invertedly in the sense explained in chapter I of this book. (Despite being a philosophical school of the Mahayana, Mahamadhyamaka, which is based on both the Third and the Second Promulgations, but which incorporated the "continuity" view of he Buddha-nature taught in Maitreyanatha's *Uttaratantra* and received influences from the Dzogchen teachings, agrees with the latter teaching in not viewing the Buddha-nature as a mere potentiality that will have to become actual.)

Concerning the alleged identity of thatness (Skt. *tathata*; Tib. dezhinnyi [*de bzhin nyid*]) and the nature of phenomena (Skt. *dharmata*; Tib. chönyi [*chos nyid*]), as noted in Capriles (2003, 2004, 2005), according to the gradual Mahayana thatness first unveils in the second bodhisattva path, which is the path of preparation or path of application (Skt. *prayogamarga*; Tib. jor lam [*sbyor lam*]), and in particular in the first of the four stages of this path, which is the one called "heat" (Skt. *ushmagata*; Tib. drö [*drod*]). Therefore, it could not be the same as the nature of phenomena, which only comes to unveil upon attainment of the third bodhisattva path—the path of Seeing (Skt. *darshanamarga*; Tib. tong lam [*mthong lam*]).

[262] Non-conceptual as I use the term does not mean "not involving the explicit understanding of the definition of a concept that obtains after the concept has been problematized," but simply "not involving intuitive understanding in terms of a concept." Though Kant is right in that aesthetic judgments are nonconceptual, from the standpoint of this book the important difference is the one between delusorily valued thoughts (whether these be of the type Kant called "concepts," of the kind he called "judgments," of the kind he called "ideas," or of the kind he called "ideals") and the lack of such thoughts.

[263] Also in the text "*Logos*" (Heidegger [1951]) it is obvious that Heidegger did not manage to separate the original sense of *logos* from the later sense of "saying," or to free himself from Aristotle's influence, for that matter.

[264] From a logical standpoint, the usage of the term *being* to refer to the Base would not be more defective than that of the term dagnyi chenpo (*bdag nyi chen po*)—"total I" or "total selfhood"—that is used for that purpose in the Semde (*sems sde*) series of Dzogchen teachings, for "I" is a term that both logically and in common usage refers to our own limited identity (which is defined by *differentia specifica* with all that is not-I), but in the Semde is used to refer to that which has no limits and that (is) the true nature of all essents (so that with regard to it there is no not-I).

If it is considered permissible to refer to the true condition of ourselves and all essents by the term "total I" (or by its Buddhist opposite, *anatman* or dagme [*bdag med*], which is as dualistic as "I" or "self"), then it should be equally permissible to call it "total being" (or "total nonbeing," for that matter). However, there has never been such a usage either in the history of Dzogchen or in that of Buddhism. At any rate, usage of this term would require a warning with regard to the logical problems involved. The real problem lies in the fact that Guenther does not simply refer to the Base as being, *but tells us that the meaning of* "*Base*" *is the same as that of* das Sein *in Heidegger*—which, as we have seen, in Dzogchen terms is the *concealment of the Base* by the most general and basic manifestation of delusion.

[265] In his discourse of acceptance of rectorship at the University of Freiburg, Part of Heidegger's message was (abstract offered in Löwith [1988], cited in Vásquez [2005]):

"Prometheus, symbol of the Western will, is the 'first philosopher', who must be followed. With such a Promethean will, European man at the origin, in the Greeks, would have 'revolted against the essent' in order to interrogate it with regard to its being, and this revolutionary insurrection would characterize the 'Spirit' that certainly fails in face of the superiority of fate, but, by the same token, becomes the creator of his own powerlessness. Spirit would then not be a general reason of an intellect or intelligence, or even less of what in Germany is called mind (French: *esprit*), but a 'conscious determination' in favor of the essence of being, and the true 'spiritual world' would be a 'world of extreme risk, of the deepest risk'. In fact, risk is the 'vocation' of the human being, as Nietzsche put it in his Zarathustra. With military rigor, the student is asked that in his desire to know, he 'approaches' the 'place of extreme risk', that he marches, that he commits himself and exposes himself, the he endures, that he resists, in a word, that he be resolved to assume the German destiny that finds itself in Hitler.

"Even the German term Gemüt (heart-soul-character) is near that Mut (courage). Likewise, the enemy is not simply 'existent'; the *Dasein* would have to manufacture his enemy in order not to weaken himself. In general, all that is, is 'ruled by struggle', and where there is neither struggle nor domination, there is decadence."

It seems unthinkable that ecologists may have taken as their guide someone who incited his listeners to follow Prometheus—the embodiment of rebellion against the natural order, who stole the Ambrosia from the gods so that humankind could forever elude death—and who went so far as to ask them to “assume the German destiny that finds itself in Hitler.” Löwith then tells us with regard to the call for the students to vote Heidegger made as Rector:

“It was thus expressed: ‘German men and women! The Führer calls the German people to vote. But the Führer is not asking the people anything. Rather, he is giving the people the most direct possibility of deciding in the highest freedom: that is, whether it—the whole people—wants its own *Dasein* or does not want it. That vote is hardly comparable to all of the people’s elections that have taken place until today. The singularity of that ballot comes from the simple greatness of the decision that must accomplish itself through it. But the implacability of what is simple and ultimate does not allow indecision or hesitation. This ultimate decision reaches the extreme limit of our people’s *Dasein*. And what is that limit? It consists in that original demand of every *Dasein* which lies in safeguarding and saving its own essence. Thereby a barrier is erected between what may be and what may not be demanded to a people...

“By the power of that fundamental law of honor is that a people preserves the dignity and determination of its nature. It is not ambition, the quest for glory, a blind obstinacy or a thirst for power, but solely the clear will of an absolute self-responsibility of our people to assume and master its destiny, which has led the Führer to get out of the League of Nations. It is not a matter of giving our back to the community of peoples. On the contrary, through this decision, our people places itself under the essential law of the human *Dasein*, to which every people, if it wants to continue to be a people, must give precedence in obeying. It is precisely on the basis of this common, loyal response, which goes in a single direction, made on the unconditional demand of self-responsibility, and only starting from it, that the possibility grows of taking each other seriously with the aim of then saying ‘yes’ to the community...

“On November 12 the entire German people will choose its future. The latter is linked to the Führer. The people cannot determine that future through a ‘yes’ founded on alleged considerations of foreign policy, without that ‘yes’ comprising also the Führer and the action that he must accomplish as a mission. There is no internal policy or foreign policy. There is only this will of a complete existence of the State. The Führer awoke that will in the whole people and with it forged a unique decision. No one may remain outside, on the day of the manifestation of that will! (*Freiburger Studentenzeitung*, November 10, 1933)...”

Löwith then tells us:

“One week before that electoral call, Heidegger published a very general call to the students (*Freiburger Studentenzeitung*, November 3, 1933) in which he declared the National-Socialist revolution to have produced a ‘complete upheaval of our German *Dasein*’. It corresponded to the students to keep, in their will to know, to the essential, to the simple, and to the great; to show themselves hard and sincere in their demands, clear and firm in their rejections; to commit themselves with a fighting spirit and allow the spirit of sacrifice to grow in them for the salvation of the essence and the growth of the power of the people. The ruler of the students’ *Dasein* should not be ideas. Hitler should be their only law: ‘The Führer himself and only him is the German reality and its law—of today and of tomorrow’. Even before the revolution, Heidegger had said that Hitler was, among all candidates to the chancellery, the only one having a ‘face’. The ‘Heil Hitler’ was taken very seriously by Heidegger, who even concluded his private correspondence with that formula. The German salutation was pronounced thousand of times by the citizens, just as in the past ‘Grüss Gott’ or ‘auf Wiedersehen’. It was necessary to be truly original, like my Munich cobbler, in order to reply to the ‘Heil Hitler’ of the costumers who entered his shop with a ‘Servus’.”

And he concludes:

“[Heidegger] was and he continued to be National-Socialist, just like Ernst Jünger...”

[266] In Sartre, the Self is *individual* and “infests being-for-Self as its full *individual* realization.” As understood herein, *qua* Base the Self is *the true condition of the individual*; however, though being-for-Self may see the *Soi* or Self as an individual essent (and it may even be hypostatized, projected outside the world and taken for a personal, transcendent God), in truth it is not an individual essent, for the Base is beyond the divisions between individuals: it (is) what all essents (are) *in truth*… And yet it is not universal, for the realization of the Self-*qua*-Base in the Self-*qua*-Path or in the Self-*qua*-Fruit by one individual does not imply its realization by other individuals.

[267] For long it has been universally recognized that human experience is the product of an active process: first neurological and other processes produce spatiotemporal phenomena; then the mind *cum* mental events complex selects and singles out its objects, clings to them for as long as it is convenient, interprets them and so on. However, no matter how aware one may be of this, in normal deluded experience the mental subject seems to be a passive recipient of experiences, on the one hand, and an active doer of action, thinker of thought, etc. on the other. In other words, though we know the Aristotelian and Leninist model of perception to betray the functionality of reality, it responds to the appearance, inherent in normal human delusion, of the mental subject as a passive recipient of experiences (as well as an active doer of action, thinker of thought, etc.). And even if we know that, as Heraclitus said, "though the *logos* is common each individual believes him or herself to have a particular intellect of his or her own," when we think, act and so on we feel that *we* as separate sources of intentionality and action are acting.

[268] As briefly shown in chapter I, tsel (*rtsal*) or "projective" energy is the one that seems to constitute an external dimension—causing dang (*gdangs*) energy to be experienced as an internal dimension.

[269] Is the being of the phenomena of dang (*gdangs*) energy which, after the arising of tsel (*rtsal*) energy, seem to constitute an "internal dimension or jing (*dbyings*), and which manifest to the sixth sense posited by Buddhism, which is the one apprehending thought, being-for-Self or being-that-is-in-itself-for-being-for-Self? Though it is certainly not part of being-for-Self, for being-for-Self is the being of that which manifests as subject rather than the being of that which manifests as object, most of the time we do not experience the phenomena in question as having the quality of in-itself described by Heidegger in a passage of *Being and Time* cited in a previous chapter of this Book. That this is so is clear insofar as we have a certain degree of control over our thoughts, and, as shown by Descartes' dictum *cogito ergo sum*, are under the illusion that we produce our thoughts.

However, as will be shown in the following note, very often we experience thoughts as being-in-itself: this happens whenever we cannot control them.

[270] A pencil certainly offers resistance to us, but since we can easily manipulate it for writing or drawing, the experience of its in-itself character is not as stark as in the case of a big rock blocking our way. The case of thoughts is not so different from this except in that in their case we do not have to use the body: most often it suffices that we conceive the intention and the mental impulse, in order to control them.

It could be objected that there is an abysmal difference between the realm of thought and that of physical object insofar as in general we control thoughts merely with conceiving the intention to do so and giving rise to the corresponding mental impulse. However, the fact that thoughts offer resistance to us is proven by the example of beginner meditator of Semde (*sems sde*) who is instructed to prevent any thought from arising in his mind—yet the more he or she tries to prevent the arising of thoughts, the more thoughts arise, and do so with more power and speed. Then she or he is instructed not to allow any gap between thoughts—and as a result of this she or he, for the first time in her or his live, notices long gaps between thoughts.

Furthermore, if I am a good Buddhist monk and I set to meditate on a statue of Shakyamuni, when I direct my attention toward the statue I get the impression that I am in control of the impulse that sets it on the object: there seems to be a duality between the mental subject and the impulse, but the mental subject seems to be in control of it. Then a very attractive girl dressed in a mini-skirt and a see-through blouse comes into the temple as a tourist and enters the periphery of my attention. At this point the impulse automatically tends to direct my attention away from the statue of Shakyamuni and toward the girl, but since I am a good monk I struggle to keep it on the object: at the point when attention was automatically shifting toward the girl I was experiencing a duality between the mental subject and the impulse, but the latter, rather than being felt to be fully under the control of the mental subject, seemed to be behaving rather autonomously, and it almost managed to direct my attention toward the object against my wishes. However, then I managed to take control of the mental factor or event and concentrate on the statue, and therefore, though there was still the appearance of a duality between the mental subject and the impulse, again I felt the mental subject was in control of the impulse.

[271] This is what Heidegger called thrownness (German, *Geworfenheit*): the state of being "thrown" (German, *Geworfen*).

[272] The French original reads "himself" rather than "itself." However, below in the regular text being-for-Self will be defined as nondual awareness (of) the mental subject as an essent that *is*; insofar as neither primordial nondual awareness (the Gnitive aspect of the Base) not the spurious appearance of the mental subject are corporeal phenomena involving color, form or any other characteristics perceivable through

the senses, and therefore neither of them has sex or gender, I cannot agree to referring to the nondual awareness (of) the mental subject as an essent that *is* by pronouns implying sex or gender. Therefore, rather than replacing "himself" for "him or herself," I chose to replace it for the impersonal pronoun "itself." Of course this does not mean that the mental subject is a mere thing, which as such lacks intentionality; it is the opposite of a mere thing, as its essence is intentionality, but I do not want to give rise to the mistaken idea that it is a soul or self.

[273] Sartre writes in a footnote (1980, p. 129):

"To this type of negation the Hegelian opposition belongs. But this opposition must itself be founded on the primitive internal negation, that is, on the lack. For example, if the inessential becomes in its turn the essential, this is so because it is felt as a lack in the bosom of the essential."

[274] As stated in the first note to this chapter, the Self cannot be said to be individual, for the Base is beyond the divisions between individuals, and yet it cannot be said to be universal insofar as, were it universal, when *nirvana* manifested in one individual continuum, it would manifest in all individual continua. The point is that, as has already been noted, the Self cannot be defined with precision in *any* terms.

[275] As I use the term, the Self cannot be said to involve either duality or a mental subject. When in the Self-*qua*-Base (which will be defined below in the regular text so that it may correspond to Dzogchen-*qua*-Base) *samsara* arises, duality and the mental subject arise; however, they do so as conventional truth, which as already noted is deluded truth, and so they may *not* be said to *truly* manifest. When in the Self-*qua*-Base *nirvana* manifests (whether as the Self-*qua*-Path or as the Self-*qua*-Fruit), *duality and the mental subject self-liberate*—and so long as *nirvana* continues to be active they simply *do not manifest*, even as delusive appearances of conventional truth.

[276] For a detailed explanation of how the arising of dualistic consciousness and the latter's experiencing itself as being at a distance from the wholeness and plenitude of the Self as redefined in this book, gives rise to the experience of lack of plenitude and lack of value that is at the root of all value, see Capriles (1993, 1994b, 1994a, 2000b); general references to the subject centered on the extensive explanation of the First Noble Truth are found in Capriles (1977, 1986, 2000a, 2003).

[277] The Dzogchen teachings do not characterize as *Value* the condition called Dzogchen (total plenitude and perfection). However, the katak (*ka dag*) aspect of that which the Dzogchen teachings call Dzogchen (is) a continuum of wholeness and plenitude, and its lhundrub (*lhun grub*) aspect (is) a spontaneously perfect functioning characterized by consummate spontaneity. When dualistic consciousness arises, illusorily disrupting the wholeness of the continuum, an illusory mental subject seems to be at a distance from the continuum of plenitude that we interpret as a physical universe (which Einstein, in the belief that it was actually a physical universe, represented as a continuum of energy involving no empty spaces), and so experiences the lack of the wholeness that in its experience has been disrupted, and of the plenitude of the continuum of which now it feels at a distance. Therefore, it engages in a myriad of activities aimed at recovering the plenitude / value that it has lost—or at least at distracting itself from the experience of lack of plenitude / value (which involves self-deceit, for consciousness has to believe that it wants that which it is supposed to seek rather than the distraction represented by seeking). In its turn, the dynamic whereby dualistic consciousness becomes the entity referred to by an individual's name gives rise to self-hindering, which interferes with the consummate spontaneity inherent in the condition called Dzogchen.

Thus when redefining the Self according to the needs of the view expressed in this book, instead of saying that the Self is value, we would have to say that the Self is total plenitude and perfection, the loss of which is at the root of all types of value. For a detailed explanation of this, see Capriles (1993, 1994a, 1994b, 2000a); general references to it are found also in Capriles (1976, 1986, 2000b).

[278] The existence of the subject implies a duality between itself and its objects. However, this Sartrean definition implies a duality *within the subject*—which therefore could not be the mental subject as understood here, which simply cannot involve an internal duality. No matter how understand the term, however, Sartre's definition is inadmissible insofar as the subject, no matter how we conceive it, *never truly existed* in the Self-*qua*-Base, and, as we have seen, the illusion of there being a subject dissolves temporarily on the occasion of the manifestation of the Self-*qua*-Path and definitively on the occasion of the manifestation of the Self-*qua*-Fruit.

[279] Arthur Koestler's concept of the "holon," intended to overcome the dichotomy between parts and wholes and to account for both the self-assertive and the integrative tendencies of an organism, was introduced in Koestler (1967) and was presented again at the Alpbach Symposium (1968) in a paper titled: "Beyond

Atomism and Holism - the concept of the holon". For an exposition of the concept, cf. the Appendix to the intervention at the Alpbach Symposium, in Koestler & Smythies (1970).

[280] In fact, Sartre's *holon, soi* or Self is definitively not Aristotle's immovable motor, which was the final cause (*telos*) of human existence. In Sartre (1980), pp. 137-8, we read:

"…The relation between value and the for-Self is very particular: [value] is the being that [the for-Self] is to be insofar as it is the foundation of its own nothingness of being [i.e. nonbeing]. And if [the for-Self] is to be this being, it is not so under an external constraint, or because value, like Aristotle's first motor, would exert upon it a *de facto* attraction, or by virtue of a character received from its being; rather, it is that it makes itself be in its being as having to be this being."

[281] Both Sartre's *holon* and the Self-*qua*-Path and Self-*qua*-Fruit discussed in this book are equal to the Christian God in their self-sufficiency, their full identity / coincidence with themselves, and other of their characteristics. However, there are important differences as well; firstly, the Christian God is conceived egomorphically (i.e., as a deluded human being who were omnipotent and omniscient), thus differing both from Sartre's *holon* and from the Self-*qua*-Path and Self-*qua*-Fruit; secondly, the Christian God is seen as having created the world through action "at the beginning of time", which is also not the case either with Sartre's *holon* of with the Self-*qua*-Path and Self-*qua*-Fruit: in the view expressed here, it is the Self-*qua*-Base that creates the world, and rather than doing so intentionally through action "at the beginning of time," it is unintentionally, actionlessly creating the world all the time. Cf. Namkhai Norbu & Clemente (1999).

[282] Nietzsche noted that, just like the Phoenix,

"You should yearn to burn in your own flames;
how will you rise anew into a new being unless you first become ashes?"

In its turn, a posthumous sonnet by Fichte says (in theistic terms that I systematically exclude from my descriptions):

"The Eternally One Lives in my living, Sees in my seeing, nothing exists but God and God is nothing but life; this veil rises very clearly before you. This veil is the `I'; let die that which is mortal, and which lives only in your desire. Penetrate that which survives this desire and the veil will become visible to you as a veil, and (then) without a veil you will see the Divine Living."

[283] Hegel understood the term *thetic* in the sense of "putting" or "positing" the object. In general, *positional* means "of position" or "relating to position," whereas *reflexive* means, "turning back toward oneself," "reflecting upon oneself" or simply "reflecting." According to Hegel, the *thetic* was previous to the *reflexive*, and the *reflexive* was a development of the thetic: putting and positing the object and directing one's attention to it was previous to orienting one's attention toward oneself. An example of this in the *Phenomenology of Mind* is that "sensory certitude" (awareness of objects as existing externally to one's awareness in an objective world and as being this or that) is previous to self-consciousness (which is the fruit of the posterior dialectic of the master and the slave).

Sartre is not an idealist philosopher believing that objects are put by the mind, and so the terms *thetic* and *positional* are to be understood to refer to the recognition of what was already there, as being this or that (it must be noted that we find no references in Sartre [1980], to Hegel's view of the "reflexive" as a development of the "thetic and positional"). Furthermore, in Sartre (1980) no clear distinction is made between "non-thetic, non-positional consciousness" and the "pre-reflexive *cogito*:" both terms seem to refer to the nondual awareness which I have reinterpreted in terms of the Dzogchen metaphor of a mirror which is not inherently *thetic* and *positional*, though it can manifest a *thetic*, *positional* function by showing the image consisting in the dualistic, directional structure of consciousness that involves the illusion of a mental subject in what seems to be its noetic pole and the illusion of there being an object in its noematic pole. However, Sartre seems to have believed dualistic, thetic, positional consciousness to be inherent in what I am representing by the mirror. (The example of the mirror is not precise, for the Dzogchen teachings do not posit a self-existing reality external to the mirror that would be passively reflected by the latter: all appearances, including the dualistic, directional structure of consciousness, manifest as the play of the energy aspect of the awareness illustrated by the mirror, which therefore is spontaneous and creative rather than merely reflecting. Therefore, this example does not illustrate either an Aristotle-like theory of perception modeled on seals and wax, or a Leninist theory of perception as passive reception.)

[284] As will be seen in various passages of Sartre (1980) cited below, Sartre writes "conscience non-thétique, non-positionelle (de) soi," and warns that the preposition "of" is in brackets in order to make clear that

the phrase does not posit a relation of knowledge, such as the one that takes place when a subject is conscious *of* an object, and that the said preposition is in the phrase only because French grammar requires it. Some times I also use parentheses this way—not only in the case of the preposition "of," but also in those occasions in which grammar requires the usage of the verb "to be," yet what (is) being described does not involve the delusive *phenomenon of being*.

285 See note before last.

286 The standard translation of *both* definitions is "non-thetic, non-positional self-consciousness," which would not allow me to enter into a detailed discussion of Sartre's original conception, and would not allow me to discuss in detail this nondual awareness (of) dualistic consciousness. Thus I prefer to keep the French structure of the term, which will be helpful for a correct understanding of some subtle discussions that will follow.

287 If the *arche* were nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional, nonreflexive awareness, it could be said to be the luminous transparency of awareness (to) itself—and hence someone could possibly contend that it is the same as the *Lichtung* in terms of which Heidegger interpreted Heraclitus' *pyr*, as reinterpreted in this book.

288 See the note standing five notes before the present one.

289 This objection applies to the conception of the absolute Je Tsongkhapa developed in his Lamrim works, for what he posited as the absolute was the manifestation as object of the presence of the absence of the mode of existence we mistakenly project on entities. Insofar as this presence of an absence appears as object, it is relative to the knower; insofar as it is the presence of the absence of the mode of existence we mistakenly project on entities, it is relative to the mode of existence in question; insofar as Tsongkhapa asserted it to be existent, it is relative to nonexistence; etc. For a detailed discussion of this cf. Capriles (2005) and the upcoming definitive version in print, of Capriles (2004).

290 As we have seen repeatedly, the absolute, in the sense of that which (is) not relative, cannot be understood in terms of any concept, for all concepts are defined by *genus proximum* and *differentia specifica*, and therefore are relative to the *genus proximum* and to the *differentia specifica*. As we have also seen, the concept of being may have no *genus proximum*, but at any rate it has a *differentia specifica*.

291 Since I am referring to the original condition of reality before it is experienced and interpreted by dualistic consciousness, ultimately it should not be said to involve "fullness," for then it would be the opposite of "emptiness" or of "incompleteness." However, we have to use words, and metaexperientially speaking the term that seems to describe this condition best is precisely the one used by Sartre: "fullness."

292 The twelve links or *nidana* of interdependent origination or *pratitya samutpada*, the understanding of which is at the root of the realization of pratyekabuddhas or "solitary realizers" in what the Mahayana refers to as the Hinayana, may be explained as follows (Namkhai Norbu [1999/2001], p. 153.):

(A) The first three, which are the determining causes, are: (1) unawareness of the true condition and delusion (*avidya*), (2) repetitive mental formations (*samskara*), and (3) consciousness (*vijñana*);

(B) The four links that are the result of the determining causes are: (4) name-and-form (*namarupa*), (5) sense bases (*sadayatana*), (6) contact (*sparsha*), and (7) sensation (*vedana*);

(C) The three links that are the causes of existence are: (8) desire (*trishna*), (9) attachment (*upadanaskandha*), and (10) becoming (*bhava*);

(D) The two links that are the result of the causes of existence are: (11) birth (*jati*), and (12) old-age-and-death (*jaramarana*).

This interpretation views interdependence as a sequence in time; the Madhyamaka school of the Mahayana, without rejecting this interpretation of interdependence, also views it in the sense of co-emergent arisings which, insofar as they are mutually dependent, are both empty of self-being.

293 In Lipman (1983/1986), we read that the Yogachara philosopher Vinitadeva, in his Commentary to Vasubandhu's Commentary to the *Vimshatika*, warned that the Sanskrit prefix *matra* (the Tibetan equivalent of which is *tsam*) not only referred to the well-known fact—emphasized in Vasubandhu's Commentary—that the Yogachara school flatly rejected the independent, external existence of the "object" (Skt. *artha*; Tib. dön [*don*]), but applied equally to the subjective side of experiencing, the independent existence of which is equally rejected by this school. Lipman also reminds us that, according to another Yogachara philosopher, Sthiramati, *both* the self *and* the configurations of events and meanings with which it deals, have *no* "in itself" status and do not exist at all apart from the experiencing process. In fact, the Yogachara School does not posit an absolutely real, substantial,

dualistic consciousness existing prior to knowledge of objects, and so to some extent may be seen as agreeing with the above quotation from Sartre.

[294] Bhavaviveka is regarded as the founder, not only of the *Madhyamaka-Swatantrika-Sautrantika*, but of the *Madhyamaka-Swatantrika* in general. This is not correct insofar as also Arya Vimuktasena was a *Madhyamika-Swatantrika*, and was much earlier than Bhavya (Arya Vimuktasena asserted that external objects do not exist and therefore is classified, together with Jatari and Lavapa, within on of the two main trends of *Madhyamaka-Swatantrika-Yogachara*; though Shantarakshita, of the other main trend of *Madhyamaka-Swatantrika-Yogachara*, is often considered to have been the founder of this subschool, Arya Vimuktasena seems to have been the true founder, not only of *Madhyamaka-Swatantrika-Yogachara*, but of *Madhyamaka-Swatantrika* in general.) (Napper [1983], p. 279.)

Furthermore, though, as noted in the regular text, Bhavaviveka is viewed as the founder of the *Madhyamaka-Swatantrika-Sautrantika*, Shura—who was later than Arya Vimuktasena but earlier than Bhavya—was a Madhyamika who, like Bhavya, asserted the existence of external objects (*ibidem*); therefore, not only it would be inexact to view Bhavya as the founder of the *Swatantrika* interpretation of *Madhyamaka*, but it would be imprecise to consider him to have been the initiator of the *Madhyamaka-Swatantrika-Sautrantika* subschool.

At any rate, Bhavaviveka is generally held to have been the first Buddhist thinker who insisted that consciousness was part of the phenomenal world, and who substantiated this view with a plethora of arguments. However, if we understand "phenomenal" in the etymological sense of the term—i.e., as that which appears in general, and not in the restricted sense of that which appears as object to a subjective consciousness—as will be seen below in the regular text, the Semde (*sems sde*) series of Dzogchen teachings already viewed the consciousness-*cum*-mental-subject complex as being a mere phenomenon / appearance lacking any kind of substance, for it illustrated primordial awareness with the example of a mirror, in which, when *samsara* manifested, the subject and the object(s) arose co-emergently as merely delusive appearances.

[295] In Buddhist systems, it seems to be a general rule that the Sanskrit term *dharma* and the Tibetan term chö (*chos*) are applied solely to phenomena appearing as object. However, we know that the English terms "phenomenon" and "phenomena" derive from the Greek *phainomenon*, meaning "that which appears:" this is why, as we have seen, Sartre said that (dualistic) thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness is no more than a phenomenon existing only insofar as it appears.

So when I say the Dzogchen teachings view the mental subject as being phenomenal I am not saying that they view it as a *dharma* appearing as object: what I say is that they view it as a mere appearance that has actuality only insofar as it appears and that, on the top, is a baseless delusion-inducing appearance. In fact, the mental subject does not appear as an object of primordial awareness, but as a subject *in it* (as in a mirror), and is not a corporeal phenomena featuring characteristics that may be apprehended through the five senses, but an incorporeal phenomenon of dang (*gdangs*) energy involving no such characteristics: it is no more than the impression, which manifests in all cognitions and actions, that inside the body there is a perceiver / doer that is the one that cognizes or acts. As we have seen, this is what Descartes took to be a *res cogitans* and which he conceived as an immortal and substantial though incorporeal soul.

[296] The cornerstone of his system was the certainly of the *cogito*, but this would not do for substantiating the supposedly objective existence of an "external world." Therefore what Descartes intended to be the single foundation of his conceptual building did not serve for sustaining the whole edifice: he had to resort to the dogmas of the Church and assert that if we were created by God and we have the idea of an external world, then God must have put that idea in us, and since God is supremely good he may not have meant to deceive us; therefore, there has to be an external world.

[297] However, this critique of the mind is not done until Book I, Part IV of the *Treatise*, and Hume seems not to care as to whether or not it affects his reflections on Book I, Part I, which he kept unchanged. Hence he keeps some notion of a mind as something actual or effective.

[298] To the Base is inherent a nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional, nonreflexive primordial awareness which has been compared unto a mirror's reflectiveness, and which may be used for illustrating the three aspects of the Base that were described in the first chapter of this book: (1) in terms of this metaphor, essence or ngowo (*ngo bo*) is the mirror's voidness, which allows it to "fill itself" with any form; (2) nature or rangzhin (*rang bzhin*) is the mirror's reflectiveness, which makes it reflect without interruption; and (3) the mirror's energy or thukje (*thugs rje*) is what gives rise to uninterrupted manifestation and involves

the process of uninterrupted manifestation and the myriad manifestations in the mirror. (Cf. the discussion of this in note 68 to this volume.) In terms of this metaphor, it is the play of the mirror's energy that gives rise to both *samsara* and *nirvana*, and it is the same play that, as a most basic phenomenon of *samsara*, gives rise to dualistic, thetic, positional, reflexive consciousness.

[299] The statement according to which nondual, nonthetic, nonpositional, nonreflexive awareness is the most conspicuous manifestation of the universal Heraclitian *logos* in human beings is a concession to common sense, for the wording implies that there are human beings in whom this awareness manifests, as there are jars that may be filled with water—which is certainly not the case. It would be less incorrect to say that what we call "human beings" are functions of this awareness. However, I will not enter into this discussion insofar as this would deviate us from the course of our inquiry.

Sartre's thesis that consciousness is made possible by an underlying nondual awareness could not be rooted in the bare manifestation of that awareness upon the dissolution of dualistic consciousness, for he does not contemplate this possibility; therefore, his thesis seems to be a metaphysical position (which as such is subject to Derrida's assertion that phenomenology is a [crypto]metaphysics). The Dzogchen teachings, instead, posit an underlying awareness because Dzogchen practitioners have had the direct realization of this nondual awareness when dualistic consciousness dissolves in *nirvana*, and then have experienced how in the same nondual awareness dualistic consciousness arises when *samsara* is reestablished. Thus in the case of the Dzogchen teachings, nondual awareness is not a metaphysical postulate, but a finding rooted in the (meta)phenomenological hermeneutics of the experiences of *samsara*, *nirvana* and the base-of-all.

In German, consciousness is *Bewußtsein*, which Karl Marx naïvely defined as *das bewußte Sein* ("conscious being," sometimes rendered as "thinking being"): the etymology of the term reflects the basic human delusion, which takes consciousness to be a "conscious (or thinking) being," when the truth is that the being of consciousness is a delusory product of the delusory valuation-absolutization of the "threefold thought structure." Husserl made it clear that every intentional structure had on one side a mental subject (the noetic pole of the structure) and on the other side an object of knowledge (the noematic pole of the structure), but made the same mistake as Descartes and deemed consciousness to be substantial rather than a mere phenomenon. Aware of the problems the discussion of consciousness had put in Husserl's way, in his successive systems Heidegger refused to give consciousness the chief role, which he gave to the *Dasein* or human existent (which, according to him, always involved an intentional structure that, however, was neither in the *Dasein* nor in the things the *Dasein* dealt with, but somehow "in between" the one and the others); however, rather than allowing Heidegger to produce a correct description of the ontological structures of the human reality (i.e. the human dynamic of *samsara*), this prevented him from making his description truly accurate and detailed. For his part, Sartre reintroduced human consciousness into the picture without falling into Husserl's error, and thus he managed to describe quite accurately that functionality in terms of the relations between a being-for-Self and a being-in-itself, thus succeeding in de-composing the indefinite abstraction that many philosophers in the West had called "the subject" but had not managed to unravel and explain in really clear terms. In fact, Sartre explained how being-for-Self often *became* segments of what he called being-in-itself, becoming being-for-others, and so on.

Furthermore, while Heidegger privileged the relationships between the *Dasein* and nonhuman things, and Hegel's treatment of relationships between human individuals had been centered on the dialectic of the master and the slave, characteristic of less sophisticated individuals who only care for power over other individuals, Sartre privileged the relationships between "beings-for-Self" in terms of the dialectic of the lover and the beloved, of which the dialectic of the masochist and the sadist (still different from that of the master and the slave) was a deviation, and successfully explained how we ascend and descend in the wheel of samsara as a result of the quality of the Other's look—which so far only Catholic existentialist Louis Lavelle had successfully explained in terms of his categories of "transascent" and "transdescent" (Lavelle [1933]). Though Sartre's main concern was not the nature of being, his description of the different modes of being and the relationships between these (i.e. of the ontological structure of *samsara* and in particular of intersubjectivity) is so sophisticated that Heidegger should have envied it.

(The philosophy of Louis Lavelle is to a great extent contrary to the views and aims of genuine Wisdom-traditions and akin to that of Descartes, for as it asserted the need to overcome the "natural spontaneity of the instinct" and insisted that the way to achieve this was to subordinate this spontaneity to reflection and rational discipline. However, I find his concept of "total presence" [Lavelle 1992] easier to mistake for a Dzogchen concept than Heidegger's *das Sein*. Furthermore, unlike Heidegger, Lavelle acknowledged

and explored consciousness and its structures—which led him to discovery two different ways in which the self-consciousness of being-for-others may affect the individual (the transascent and transdescent mentioned in the preceding paragraph of this note). However, unlike Sartre's, Lavelle's categories do not lend themselves to a redefinition that would allow them to express the essential metaontological view of the Dzogchen teachings. Besides, Sartre's atheism is in harmony with Buddhist nontheism, and his rejection of mysticism prevents confusion of a different kind of mysticism with that of Dzogchen. [For an introduction to Lavelle's philosophy in English see Opalek (1962); also available in English are Lavelle (1951, 1993), which, however, concerning our investigation are not the most relevant of his works.] Lavelle's philosophy belongs to the tradition of Malebranche, Maine de Biran, Octave Hamelin, Henri Bergson and Henri Blondel, which to some extent and in some sense denies reality to dualisms such as that of body and mind; Merleau-Ponty [cf. e.g. Merleau-Ponty, 2002] may be regarded as being in the same tradition—which is one of the reasons why Westerners comparing Western philosophy and Buddhism often opted for Merleau-Ponty and very rarely showed any interest in Sartre. However, I appreciate Sartre's conscientious mental disassembling of the baseless dualistic ontological structures of *samsara* more than the refutations of the body / mind dualism, which are so common in Buddhism, for they help us understand how we produce many of the illusions of *samsara*. Furthermore, a refutation of dualism that does not fully account for the dualistic structures inherent in conventional truth [which, as we know, is deluded truth, or which is the same, no truth at all, but baseless appearance] could lead to a fake non-dualism.)

[300] In *Les passions de l'âme* (I 19), he wrote: "It is true that we cannot want something else without apperceiving it (*que nous n'apercevions*) by the same means whereby we want it."

[301] In the upcoming definitive version of Capriles (2004), there is a discussion of three of the meanings of the Sanskrit terms *swasamvittih* and *swasamvedana*, and the Tibetan term *rang rig*: (1) apperception understood in terms of the spontaneous awareness (of) consciousness of object posited by the Yogachara school and some Madhyamika Swatantrika Yogachara; (2) the nondual spontaneous awareness of Mahamadhyamaka, which in *samsara* is the condition of possibility of apperception and of all types of dualistic consciousness, but in *nirvana* is utterly nondual and free from the stains of delusorily valued conceptualization; and (3) the all-liberating nondual spontaneous awareness of the Dzogchen teachings.

[302] Alain was the pseudonym of Emile-Auguste Chartier (1868-1951), author of the *Propos*, the *Idées* and the *Pensières*, and disciple of Jules Lagneau (1851-1894).

[303] This term fully coincides with one of the most usual translations of the Sanskrit terms *swasamvittih* and *swasamvedana*, and of the Tibetan term *rang rig*, all of which, in some Mahayana systems (but not so in Dzogchen), refer to awareness (of) consciousness. Cf. the preceding note.

[304] Sartre probably wrote with a fountain pen and thus needed to use blotting paper, which was often pink, or pink on one side and blue on the other. I add this note because I assume the younger readers of this book may not know what a blotting paper is.

[305] It is not absolute, for it involves the relativity of subject and object, of qualifying the sensation that is its object as pleasant rather than unpleasant or neutral, and of accepting the sensation rather than rejecting it or being indifferent to it. Sartre's error here is the same he made when he regarded the Self as being and thought it could nonetheless be an absolute, which was criticized above.

[306] According to Madhyamaka philosophy, it is only conventionally that we may speak of arising and ceasing, birth and death and so on, for if we analyze arising and ceasing, birth and death, etc. we fail to find the type of phenomena in question.

[307] In Capriles (2003) (the definitive, corrected version of which will soon be available in print) we read:

"Although the term *Tantra* has the sense of "weft" or "woof" (i.e. woven fabric), its meaning is intimately connected with that of the Sanskrit word *prabandha*, which means both "continuity" and "luminosity." This is reflected by the Tibetan word used to translate the Sanskrit term *Tantra*, which is gyü (*rgyud*): a term that in everyday language means "thread," but which in the context of the Tantric and Dzogchen teachings has the twofold meaning of "continuity" and "luminosity." Jamgön Kongtrul the Great wrote (quoted in Namkhai Norbu [1999/2001], p. 161):

"'The word gyü (*Tantra*) refers precisely to *bodhichitta*-Samantabhadra that has no beginning or end and that shines with luminous natural clarity. It 'continues" because from beginningless time until the attainment of Awakening it is always present without any interruption whatsoever.'

"*Bodhichitta*-Samantabhadra is the single, true condition of the whole of reality. From the temporal standpoint, the luminous continuity of the manifestation of this true condition is compared to a rosary in

which the beads (which represent experiences) and the empty spaces between beads in which there is only thread (which represent the spaces between one experience and the next) constantly succeed each other. Tantrism emphasizes the continuity of luminosity because in it one works with this succession of beads and spaces between beads: one neither negates the beads (our different experiences) in order to affirm the blankness of the space-between-beads, nor disclaims the blank spaces in order to affirm the beads. In fact, even though all experiences are essentially void (insofar as they lack self-existence or substance), experiences never stop arising; what we have to do is to discover their primordial nature, which is empty but at the same time "luminous" in the sense of "experience-manifesting." This is one of the reasons why the inner Nyingma Tantras explain our true condition in terms of two indivisible aspects: katak or *primordial purity*, corresponding to emptiness, and lhundrub or *spontaneous perfection*, corresponding to spontaneous manifestation and its functionality."

Furthermore, the continuity of *Tantra* is also, and principally, a continuity of Base, Path and Fruit: the Base is the Trikaya of Buddha; the Path is simply the repeated patency of this Trikaya (with emphasis on one of its aspects) for given periods while on the Path; and the Fruit is the definitive, total patency and the unhindered, consummate functionality of the Trikaya, which is never concealed or hampered again. Were this not so, the Trikaya-*qua*-Fruit of Buddhahood would be something that arises or is produced on the Path and therefore it would fall within the category indicated by the Pali term *bhèta*, the Skt. *nutpada* or *nutpatti*, and the Tib. kyepa [*skyes pa*], meaning produced / caused, the Pali and Skt. *jata* and the Tib. kyepa [*skyes pa*], meaning born, and the Pali *sankhata*, Skt. *samskrita* and Tib. düjai [*'dus byas*], meaning compounded / conditioned / constructed / made / contrived / fabricated—and as such it would be characterized by the four true marks of *samsara*, among which the first three are suffering, impurity, and impermanence, and could not be the Fruit of Buddhahood.

308 The four characteristics of the conditioned (Pali, *sankhata*; Skt. *samskrita*; Tib. düjai [*'dus byas*]) are: (1) production, birth or origination; (2) subsistence; (3) change, and (4) dissolution or disappearance.

309 The experiments of physicists do *not* suggest that there is something that is not awareness or that is different and separate from awareness. If anything, experiments such as the ones Alain Aspect carried out in the University of Paris-Sud in 1982 suggest that there (is) a basis that may be free from discrete and concrete forms and from dimensionality as we know it and understand it, on the basis of which our discrete and concrete dimensional experience arises. However, David Bohm's speculations on the basis of these experiments and of his own theories do not seem to be totally sound.

In fact, it must be noted that Kant criticized Leibniz's conception according to which dimensionality arises on the basis of relationships between monads, insisting that monads belonged to a nonphenomenal level of reality, and that insofar as relations are by nature phenomenal, Leibniz's theory implied a confusion of levels of reality (cf. Kant, 1966, Part I, Ch. 3, Appendix on the Amphibology of the Concepts of Reflection). In turn, David Bohm (1976, 1980, 1982) described the implicate order, holomovement or holoflux he posited in terms that mix concepts that only apply to a phenomenal, dimensional reality, with concepts that suggest the complete lack of a phenomenal, dimensional reality, and thus his descriptions are susceptible to objections similar to the ones Kant directed against Leibniz (furthermore, Bohm insisted the nonmanifest "lies in something immensely beyond" itself, which he called "spirit:" beside the mixture of phenomenal and nonphenomenal realities that this implies, to posit a "beyond" is certainly a metaphysical, substantialistic, dualistic thesis positing a "true reality" beyond the world). However, the main point in Bohm's theory is precisely that at the dimensional level of quantum phenomena (and more conspicuously at that of the length scale in the neighborhood of 1.616×10^{-35} meters called the Planck length—related to Planck energy by the uncertainty people) there is neither a continuous dimensionality like the one that is characteristic of our everyday experience, not a complete lack of dimensionality like the one Kant attributed to the *Ding-an-sich*. Therefore these dimensional levels cannot be described by our usual concepts except, to some extent, by resorting to contradictory statements. However, we have seen that the same applies, for different reasons and in different ways, to all levels of reality—which caused Hegel to claim that "for something to move, simultaneously it has to be and not to be in the same place," even though he was wrong in believing not only in a perfect map-territory fit, but in believing territory and map to be the same thing.

310 As the individual grows up and is socialized, the mental subject gains a great degree of control over the voluntary muscles of the body, but *not absolute control*. Even those who train to increase the mental subject's control over the body, such as gymnasts, dancers and so on, lack absolute control over it (even if a gymnast could receive ten points in all of her or his performances, this would be a relative

evaluation, and absolute perfection would be an ideal to which the gymnast would asymptotically tend). However, so long as we are under the illusion of dualism we feel we move the body as an object. Furthermore, any set of voluntary muscles of the body may be paralyzed (facial paralysis, for example, is surprisingly common in human beings), and thereby be experienced as pure being-in-itself.

[311] We have seen that, although the threefold thought structure is *a priori* in the Kantian sense, it arises with the manifestation of tsel (*rtsal*) energy and is somehow modeled after the structure of this mode of expression of energy.

[312] In this case, the "winds" are the electrochemical impulses traveling through the motor nerves; however, in other cases they may be something other than electrochemical impulses traveling through the nerves.

[313] It is primordial awareness, manifesting as the semnyi (*sems nyid*) in the sense the term is given in the *Upadeshavarga* or Menngagde (*man ngag sde*) series of Dzogchen teachings, which is the source of all knowledge and action; the mental subject feels it can to some degree control knowledge and action and thus take the Gnitiveness and motility of awareness to be its own noetic principle through its connection with the semnyi: this is why, rather than saying that the mental subject is the noetic pole of dualistic, thetic, positional consciousness, I say that it is its *seemingly* noetic pole.

[314] *Qua* phenomenologist, like Husserl, Sartre is concerned with consciousness *qua intentional consciousness*; *qua* ontologist, unlike Husserl and like Heidegger, he is concerned with determining the nature and status of being.

[315] In a passage cited in the regular text of a subsequent chapter of this volume, Longchen Rabjam wrote (1998, p. 84-87; the language was adapted to the terminology used in this book and the italics are my own):

"Although phenomena appear as they do to the mind,
they are not mind nor anything other than mind.
Given their illusory nature as clearly apparent yet unthinkable, void manifestations,
moment by moment they are beyond description, imagination or expression.
For this reason know that all phenomena that appear to the mind
are unthinkable, ineffable and empty even as they manifest.

"The apparent phenomena that manifest as the five kinds of sense objects [visual forms and so forth], and the phenomena of the universe that seem to appear in their own right, manifest to the mind and [in fact] are nothing other than [manifestations appearing to the mind]. Even though they appear to be something other [than the mind], like dreams and illusions they are by nature empty, and, [being unthinkable and ineffable, *they*] *have never been anything other* [*than mind*] *and have never been mind* [*either*]. In accordance with the eight traditional metaphors for illusoriness, an examination of phenomena as forms of emptiness, clearly apparent yet unthinkable, ineffable and void — whether considered to be composed of reducible or irreducible particles — determines their equalness in having no identity. One knows the basic space of unchanging emptiness through these natural manifestations of the nature of mind."

[316] We can *become* the object (in the case of our organism, when it is being perceived by others and we feel touched in the heart by their look, when we see our body in the mirror, and so on; in the case of all that is within the fields of our senses, when we have transpersonal experiences of the formless sphere; etc.) or feel that the object is other with regard to us; we can feel through the object (in the case of our body) or not feel through it (in the case of other bodies). However, we always experience tsel energy as object, for even when we become an object to others, we do so with regard to a mental subject rather than to a physical body.

[317] In a previous note to this chapter it was shown that this control is neither absolute nor continuous, by using the example of the beginner meditator, and in particular that of the beginner meditator in the Dzogchen Semde (*rdzogs chen sems sde*).

[318] We are subject to events such as those that Louis Lavelle called "transascent" and "transdescent," to what Sartre called "being touched in the heart by the Other's look" and thus becoming the object the Other sees as our self, and so on, whereby others give rise to mental events over which we have no control in the sphere of dang energy that we regard as our own. Likewise, very often we cannot control our thoughts, mental images and so on. However, since most of the time we seem to be in control of this sphere and since most of the time only the mental subject that we take for our soul or mind seems to have control over it, we dismiss these events and continue to believe the mental subject that we take for our soul or mind to be the master and owner of this dimension.

[319] Bertrand Russell wrote (1985):

“Common sense imagines that when it sees a table it sees a table. This is a gross delusion. When common sense sees a table, certain light waves reach its eyes, and these are of a sort that, in its previous experience, has been associated with certain sensations of touch, as well as with other people’s testimony that they also saw the table. But none of this ever brought to us the table itself. The light waves caused occurrences in our eyes, and these caused occurrences in the optic nerve, and these in turn caused occurrences in the brain. Any one of these, happening without the usual preliminaries, would have caused us to have the sensation we call ‘seeing the table’, even if there had been no table. (Of course, if matter in general is to be interpreted as a group of occurrences, this must apply also to the eye, the optic nerve and the brain.) As to the sense of touch when we press the table with our fingers, that is an electric disturbance on the electrons and protons of our finger tips, produced, according to modern physics, by the proximity of the electrons and protons in the table. If the same disturbances in our finger-tips arose in any other way, we should have the sensation, in spite of there being no table. The testimony of others is no doubt a secondhand affair. A witness in a law court, if asked whether he had seen some occurrence, would not be allowed to reply that he believed so because of the testimony of others to that effect. In any case, testimony consists of sound waves and demands psychological as well as physical interpretation; its connection with the object is therefore very indirect. For all these reasons, when we say that a man ‘sees a table’, we use a highly abbreviated form of expression, concealing complicated and difficult inferences, the validity of which may well be open to question.”

The above quotation can lead many to acknowledge that, if there were a world existing independently from our experience and externally to it, we would be unable to know it: as stated in the regular text, all we can know is the phenomena manifesting in our own awareness (however, since the fact that such a reality would be totally beyond the range of our capacity of knowledge implies that we are equally unable to verify that it does not at all exist, we would be as wrong in denying its existence as we would be in asserting it). For example, the particle-waves we call photons are supposed to produce modifications in the eye, which are supposed to produce electromagnetic disturbances in the optic nerve, which are supposed to produce certain phenomena in our brains that cause us to see light. However, there is no proof whatsoever that this experience of light is in *any way* similar to the photons that supposedly touched the eye: these photons never entered our experience, and in themselves the particle-waves that we call photons surely resemble other particle-waves, but do not seem likely to resemble in any way our experience of light. Moreover, in dreams and hallucinations we also see light, but this light does not arise in response to any supposedly external particle-waves touching the eyes. Scientists would assume that our experience is a product of the workings of the brain, but since we cannot perceive anything external to experience, the very idea that there is a brain that is not a mere experience (which we may have in the dissection of the corpses of others, from which we validly infer that we also have a brain) is clearly open to question. Since experience cannot be legitimately explained as being the function of an organ the non-experiential existence of which cannot be proven, it is easy to be tempted to claim that it is a product of our mind, or of the process of experiencing, etc.

Does the above mean, as Russell claimed, that we do not see the table? Semanticist Alfred Korzybski stated that “the pattern is the thing,” and in fact the wisest conclusion in this regard is, after putting in parentheses the existence or nonexistence of a physical reality external to human experience, to view the table as our perception of it. Bishop Berkeley (1963) intended to demonstrate the nonexistence of an external world, but the arguments he used are far more effective for avowing in favor of keeping an epoche or “suspension of judgment” concerning the existence or nonexistence of a basis of experience external to our experience:

“You could reply that... outside the mind... there could be things that are similar to the phenomena or representations of our experience, but existing outside the mind in a nonthinking substance, of which the phenomena or representations of our experience would be copies or likenesses. I reply that a phenomenon of our experience cannot be something other than a phenomenon of our experience; a color or figure cannot resemble anything but another color or figure. If we observe a bit the phenomena or representations of our experience (whether in perception, reminiscence or fantasy), we shall find it impossible to conceive a similitude except between [various] phenomena or representations of our experience. Again, I ask whether the supposedly original or external things, of which [according to the realist] the phenomena or representations of our experience would be images or representations, would

themselves be perceivable or not be so. If they were, then they would be phenomena or representations of experience [rather than the originals posited by the realist] and we would be right; if you say they are not, I will ask anyone whether it makes sense to assert that a color resembles something that is invisible; whether the hard and the soft [may resemble] something that is intangible; and so on and on concerning the rest [of the qualities we perceive]."

What Berkeley's arguments and the subsequent discoveries of modern physics really managed to show was that it does not make sense to posit the existence of an external, independent reality *having forms and colors and so on*, for it is a truism—which Wittgenstein dared to state—that since we cannot see into the exterior of our experience, denying that there is something out there is just as illegitimate as asserting that there is: even children would agree that the fact that it is not possible to perceive anything external to our experience does not mean that we are entitled to assert that there is nothing external to it.

[320] These terms are discussed in a passage by Longchenpa cited in chapter VIII of this volume.

[321] Al least in the sense in which, Longchenpa reminds us, when we say "sit in the sun" we do not mean that we go to the star at the center of the solar system an sit on it, but that we sit where we receive the rays of the sun. In fact, as we have seen, according to the Dzogchen teachings, all phenomena are manifestations of awareness, of *bodhichitta*, of the single sphere, of Dzogchen-*qua*-Base, or however we call it. And though the manifestations of awareness are neither awareness nor other than awareness, their *prima materia* cannot be other than the energy aspect of awareness.

[322] Since the Self thus understood was compared with a mirror, it seems logical to ask whether or not this Self includes the whole of the reflections that the mirror manifests so long as it endures, and therefore may be defined as the mirror plus the totality of reflections it manifests so long as it continues to be a mirror. Since reflections change and replace each other while the mirror remains the same, the Self cannot be said to be one with the phenomena that, like reflections, manifests in the continuum of awareness that the mirror represents. Since reflections are not at a distance from the mirror, the Self cannot be said to be separate or different from the reflections it manifests. Since the Self is the same as the spontaneous awareness or primordial awareness of the Dzogchen teachings, all that the Dzogchen teachings say of this awareness may be said with regard to it.

[323] I.e. it does not involve space and time as relative, divided dimensions (space *qua* distance with regard to a delusory mental subject and time *qua* a present that is relative to a past and a future) or as dimensions separate from each other, and does not involve knowledge in the etymological sense emphasized by Claudel in which knowledge (*connaissance*) is the co-emergence (*co-naissance*) and mutual relativity of the knower and the known.

[324] In Shantideva (1996, p. 126, IX.107), we read:

" [Objection] How can there exist a liberated being?

"[*Madhyamika*] He is false imagination in the mind of another, but he does not exist because of conventional truth *on his own part*. After something has been established it exists; if not, it does not exist even as conventional truth."

The above means that Buddhists who lived at the time of Shakyamuni through their false imagination perceived Shakyamuni as a Buddha, but Shakyamuni, who was not subject to false imagination, did neither perceive himself as a Buddha, nor perceive others as deluded sentient beings to be helped—and yet a myriad of spontaneous activities manifested through him in the behalf of sentient beings.

[325] In the Preface to Watts (1959) we read:

"I have always been fascinated by the law of reversed effect. Sometimes I call it the 'backwards law'. When you try to stay on the surface of the water, you sink; but when you try to sink you float. When you hold your breath you lose it—which immediately calls to mind an ancient and much neglected saying, 'Whosoever would save his soul shall lose it'.... ...[in fact,] insecurity is the result of trying to be secure...

"This begins to sound like something from *Alice Through the Looking Glass*, of which this book is a sort of philosophical equivalent... This book... is in the spirit of the Chinese sage Lao-Tzu, that master of the law of reversed effect, who declared that those who justify themselves do not convince, that to know truth one must get rid of knowledge, and that nothing in more powerful and creative than emptiness—from which men shrink. Here, then, my aim is to show—backwards-fashion—that those essential realities of religion and metaphysics are vindicated in doing without them, and manifested in being destroyed."

[326] This is a way of speaking, for nondual awareness is always all-embracing. What actually happens is that there is no longer a consciousness *qua* selective, limited focus of awareness that takes a segment of the

sensory continuum as figure while leaving the rest as ground, and hence the all-embracing character is no longer missed by this restricted consciousness.

[327] Jigme Lingpa (*'jigs med gling pa***)** himself gave the title "kunkhyen" to one of his works: the *kun mkhyen zhal lug bdud rtsi'i thigs pa* (a commentary to the *gnas lugs rdo rje'i tshig rkang*). Later on, all important panditas coincided in referring to Jigme Lingpa himself by this title.

[328] Though Heidegger invented the concept of *Dasein* in order to elude the problem of the multiple modes of being of the human individual and thus be able to speak of a single human ontological reality, a more thorough phenomenology / metaphenomenology necessarily has to mentally disassemble the abstraction that the *Dasein* is and distinguish among the being of consciousness, this being of consciousness becoming the entity others perceive the individual as being, and so on. On the field of phenomenology, this is what Sartre did; on the field of metaphenomenology, this is what I have been trying to do since the mid-nineteen seventies. (For further reflections on this subject, cf. the tenth note before the present one.)

[329] Chandrakirti categorized the *dharmata* as involving being (*bhava*) and as involving self-being (*swabhava*); in the immediately following note I explain why I do not agree with this characterization.

[330] As it should be clear from the discussions in previous chapters of this volume, the voidness of the Self in the three senses the term is being give here (*qua* Base, *qua* Path and *qua* Fruit) may be understood: (1) in terms of the ngowo (*ngo bo*) or "essence" aspect of the Base discussed in the Dzogchen teachings, which as we have seen is voidness; (2) in terms of the conception of voidness as lack of self-being, proper to the Uma Rangtongpa (*dbu ma rang stong pa*) or "Madhyamaka of voidness of self-being" subschools, and (3) in terms of the conception of voidness as lack of anything that be other with regard to the Self, proper to the Uma Zhentongpa (*dbu ma gzhan stong pa*) or "Madhyamaka of the voidness of anything that be other [with regard to the Buddha-nature, or to the *dharmakaya* aspect of the Buddha-nature]" subschools.

(1) Voidness *qua* the ngowo (*ngo bo*) or "essence" aspect of the Base discussed in the Dzogchen teachings, which as we have seen is voidness: In the Dzogchen teachings, the voidness of the Self-*qua*-Base is the essence or ngowo (*ngo bo*) aspect of the Base, which is the voidness that allows whatever manifests to manifest, but which itself has no identifiable traits, and nothing to contrast it with of to include it, and therefore could by no means be properly conceived as *being*, or in terms of any other concept, for that matter: it is void of self-being—and hence is void in sense (2) of the three senses listed above—and it is void of anything extraneous to itself—and hence is void in sense (3) of the three senses listed above. At the level of the energy or thukje (*thugs rje*) aspect of the Base, the ngowo aspect of the Base has its correspondent in the dang (*gdangs*) mode of manifestation of energy, which (is) formless and intangible, and lacks identifiable characteristics. (The reader should keep in mind the comparison of some of the characteristics of the essence or ngowo aspect of the Base with nothingness in the sense of the Chinese term *wu* and the Japanese *mu* carried out in a previous chapter of this volume.)

The voidness of the Self-*qua*-Path lies in the manifestation of the *dharmakaya* while on the Path, which (is) but the reGnition of the true condition of the ngowo aspect of the Self-*qua*-Base and of the dang aspect of the energy of this Self-*qua*-Base; therefore, all that was said concerning the ngowo aspect of the Self-*qua*-Base and the dang aspect of the energy of the Self-*qua*-Base perfectly applies to the *dharmakaya* as well. In its turn, the voidness of the Self-*qua*-Fruit is the definitive manifestation of the *dharmakaya* as an aspect of the Fruit of Buddhahood.

The *Dzogpa Chenpo Kuntuzangpo Yeshe Longgi Gyü* (*rDzogs pa chen po kun tu bzang po ye shes klong gi rgyud*), a Tantra of the Dzogchen Menngagde or *Upadeshavarga* revealed by Jigme Lingpa, states (in Guenther [1977], pp. 124-125; I modified the translation of the excerpt):

"The infinitude of... primordial awareness (is) such that it [cannot be said to be] something existing eternally, for its essence (ngowo [*ngo bo*]) has no determinate traits. [Likewise, it (is) such] that [it cannot be said to be] something that has ceased to exist, insofar as its nature (rangzhin [*rang bzhin*]) is a light that is not dimmed in any way. [Furthermore, it] has neither bounds not limits, because its manifest appearance, [which is its] energy (thukje [*thugs rje*]), does not know any limits or partiality. Even when it is [considered as] ultimate emptiness, it cannot be compared with something that is empty [like a container with nothing solid or liquid in it] or with [a mere] nothingness. It is like the luster of the sun and moon, revealing in its Gnitiveness..."

In the same text, the personification of this primordial awareness then says (*ibidem*):

“My appearance is an outer no-thing-ness because in it there is no reified object, and, [likewise, in my inside there (is)] no-thing-ness… because in it [no reified/]reifying mind is found; [furthermore,] the inalienable voidness of primordial awareness [implies that this] awareness is an [undivided] limitless [totality] because [in truth] it has [never] suffered a rift. In brief, since all entities which one accepts to exist have found their fulfillment and *raison d’être* in a modality where no substance obtains, the Base is a great initial purity, the Path a great self-authentication, and the Fruit a great self-freedom.”

The Tibetan term rangzhin [*rang bzhin*], which the Dzogchen teachings use to refer to the second of the aspects of the Base, which is its “nature,” translates the Sanskrit term *swabhava* that, as we have seen, means “*self-being*;” however, the sense of the term in this context is different from the one it has in the philosophical schools of the Mahayana, and is not to be understood in the sense of “self-being” as this concept is understood in this note and throughout this book in general. And yet, insofar as the Self-*qua*-Base does not arise from causes and conditions, for it is like the mirror in which all reflections arise, but which itself neither arises nor ceases, and does not depends on the reflections that manifest in it, it may seem to coincide with the *swabhava* or “self-being” that is denied by the concept of *swabhava shunyata* or emptiness of self-being. This is why in the *Madhyamakavatarabhashya* (XV.1-2), Chandrakirti categorized the *dharmata* of true nature of all phenomena as *swabhava*:

“It is not reasonable that *swabhava* [may] arise from causes and conditions; if it did arise from causes and conditions *swabhava* would be something made. How would it be suitable for *swabhava* to be made? *Swabhava* is not fabricated and does not depend on another.”

<u>(2) Emptiness of the Self in the sense of *swabhava shunyata* or voidness of self-being:</u> We cannot agree with Chandrakirti’s categorization of the *dharmata* (and hence of the Self as understood here) as *swabhava*, for *swabhava* means self-being, and insofar as *dharmata* and “Self-*qua*-Base” are names for the true condition of all essents that, (being) all-encompassing, cannot have a *genus proximum*, and not excluding anything, cannot have a *differentia specifica*, it may not be categorized in terms of any of the four extremes, which are *being*, *nonbeing*, *both* being and nonbeing, and *neither* being nor nonbeing. And if it may *not* be categorized as *being*, far less could it be categorized as *involving self-being*. This is why Nagarjuna never claimed that the *dharmata* or true nature of all essents could be categorized in terms of the concept of being, and he never used the concept of self-being (*swabhava*) either as a synonym of *dharmata* or in order to categorize absolute truth. In Napper (2003), p. 713, note 243, we read:

“…although Chandrakirti explicitly uses the *term swabhava* in a positive way, there are no comparably clear and explicit uses of such by Nagarjuna in the *Madhyamakashastra* or *Mulamadhyamakakarikah*; for instance, Nagarjuna does not explicitly equate the terms *swabhava* and *dharmata* as does Chandrakirti.”

If we compare the Self with a mirror in which all appearances of subject and object arise, the metaphor itself leaves no doubt that, whereas phenomena *appear* to arise and cease, the mirror does not even *appear* to come into being or to cease to be, and therefore it is clear that some of the categorizations Chandrakirti made of the *dharmata* in the above-quoted passage apply to the Self: it is not fabricated, as it corresponds to the non-fabricatedness of the true condition of phenomena (or which is the same, [is] unconditioned and uncompounded), does not depend on another, (is) the isness of entities, and is realized by the primordial gnosis (Skt. *jñana*; Tib. yeshe) that (is) free from the dimness of unawareness. However, since this Self which (is) the true nature of all entities neither comes into being nor ceases to be, and because of the whole set of reasons adduced above, it is clear that it is beyond being and nonbeing; and since it cannot be said to *be*, far less could it be said to *involve self-being*.

Furthermore, when deluded individuals say something “*is*,” it is because in their experience that something *is sustained by the delusory phenomenon of being* resulting from the delusory valuation / absolutization of the concept of being. Since the delusory valuation-absolutization of the *concept* of being is concomitant with the delusory valuation-absolutization of the threefold projection, the *phenomenon* of being is always accompanied by the illusion that there *is* an experience, that there *is* an experiencer, and that there *is* something experienced: the dualistic consciousness and the spurious mental subject associated with it, on the one hand, and the objects that arise co-emergently with this consciousness and mental subject, on the other hand, appear to *be* (which is what the Gelugpa call “appear to exist inherently”). Since the Self is not the dualistic consciousness *cum* spurious mental subject that is *one of the poles* of dualistic knowledge, since it cannot become the other pole of dualistic knowledge which is the object of human perception, and since no concept whatsoever can correspond to it, it is impossible to have the experience

of it as something involving self-being—and since it is the illusion of self-being that samsaric individuals refer to as "being," it is impossible to experience the Self as *being* (however, it is no doubt possible to mistake the grasping at the base-of-all that gives rise to the formless sphere for the Self, and since this experience involves the illusion of self-existence, take the latter to be self-existent).

As shown in preceding chapters of this volume, this emptiness is what the Chinese call *k'ung* and the Japanese call *ku*.

(3) Emptiness of the Self in the sense of absence of anything other [with regard to the Buddha-nature or to the *dharmakaya* aspect of this nature]: The Self-*qua*-Base is void of anything extraneous to itself (i.e. of anything extraneous to the Buddha-nature, or to the *dharmakaya* aspect of this nature), for it is the single, common nature of all phenomena. In its turn, this implies the voidness of all phenomena in the sense of *swabhava shunyata* or voidness of self-existence, because if all the phenomena we experience (are) the Self-*qua*-Base, these phenomena could by no means involve self-being (furthermore, I already expounded many arguments throughout this book, and in other books as well, which prove that no phenomena may involve self-being).

[331] In the term "dagnyi chenpo" (*bdag nyid chen po*), dag (*bdag*) means "self;" nyi (*nyid*) means "[true] nature of;" and chenpo (*chen po*), which normally means "great," here means, "total." The term "dag" or "self" is used to indicate that this nature is not other than oneself; the term "nyi" or "true nature of" is used to indicate that the term "self" does not refer to our illusory, separate, limited self, but to the true nature or condition; the term "total" is used to indicate that there is nothing other than Self in this sense in which the term refers to the true nature of ourselves and of everything that in *samsara* we take not to be ourselves.

[332] According to Riedlinger, in his psychedelic experience Sartre faced the type of paranoid and "dead end" experience which Stanislav Grof has called "Perinatal Matrix 2" (BPM 2), and which according to the Czech psychologist (Grof [1985]) corresponds to the beginning of the process of biological birth itself and this process' first clinical stage, during which the original balance of intrauterine existence is interrupted, in the first place due to the chemical alarm signals, and then due to muscular contractions—a process that, once fully developed, causes the fetus to be periodically constrained by uterine spasms while the cervix is still closed and thus it is impossible to get out. From this perspective, Sartre's conception of the *holon* as the aim of human existence and yet as being unattainable—and, in general, the so-called "pessimism" of Sartre's philosophy in general—would be the result of facing a BPM 2, upon which Sartre would have intuited that the only aim of his life would be the attainment of a condition of openness and plenitude, but—given the characteristics inherent in BPM 2s—he would have felt that it was impossible to achieve it.

Independently of whether or not Grof's theories are valid, and of whether or not they may be applied to the experiences the French author had during the mescaline-induced "trip" reported in Sartre (1940), as noted in the regular text of this book, I really appreciate the early philosophy of the French thinker, which consummately explained the reasons why, insofar as being-for-Self—which in the view expressed in this book is the core of *lethe* or *avidya*—is active, it will be impossible to attain plenitude, satisfaction and so on. Furthermore, since that philosophy excluded the possibility of *nirvana*—that is, of that which Sartre called *holon*—it had the advantage of not lending itself for positing as *nirvana*, either (1) the "higher" samsaric states and in particular the formless sphere, or (2) the condition called neutral base-of-all or kunzhi lungmaten (*kun gzhi lung ma bstan*) wherein neither *samsara* nor *nirvana* are active. (If both Riedlinger's interpretation and Grof's categories were right, we would be fortunate that Sartre was trapped in a BPM 2 rather than having confused a BPM 1 or a BPM 4 with *nirvana*, for then he would not have set out to demonstrate that so far as we are being-for-Self there is no way for us to achieve satisfaction, plenitude and value, and, on the contrary, he would have probably produced a pseudo-mystical philosophy confusing samsaric states and / or the condition of the base-of-all with *nirvana*—as seems to do Heidegger's philosophy since 1929 and as seem to do many systems of transpersonal and "integral" philosophy and psychology. (And yet there is no doubt that in general for an individual who slips into that which Grof calls "holotropic experience" it is preferable to face a BPM 1 or a BPM 4 than a BPM 2.)

Instead, we have seen that some scholars have taken the philosophy of the "second Heidegger," that is based exclusively on samsaric experience, to be a philosophy of Awakening that they wrongly consider to be analogous to one or another Buddhist system, and that the terminology the German philosopher used in the said period has even been used to translate the Dzogchen teachings, thus distorting these teachings. In

terms of Grof's schemas (but using them from a Buddhist standpoint that is radically different from Grof's system), philosophies such as that of the "second Heidegger" or as the one produced by Louis Lavelle, or even some elements of the philosophy of Merleau-Ponty and other philosophers of that time, are the type of constructions that an individual familiar with monist or non-dual mysticism (as Heidegger himself was) could produce after ingesting a psychedelic substance, facing one of the Perinatal Matrices wherein "cosmic union" (e.g. BPM 1) or a high degree of openness (e.g. BPM 4) are experienced, and taking the conditioned states thus experienced to be *nirvana*—that is, the unconditioned itself. (However, I have never read of heard that any of the authors in question consumed psychedelic substances.)

Attempts to explain Dzogchen or Buddhism in terms of Heidegger's philosophy cause those who do not know Heidegger's terminology to be unable to understand the text they are reading, and cause those who know that terminology to understand the texts in an absolutely wrong sense: as thought they were saying the same as Heidegger. The advantage I see in Sartre's philosophy is that if we modify it so that it contemplates the possibility of *nirvana*, the result may be a complete system of Buddhist philosophy (cf. Capriles [1997a, 2000b, work in progress 2]); if it is not modified, no one will ever think of using it to express a Buddhist view, distorting the latter. Furthermore, though there are important contradictions between the systems of Heidegger, Sartre, Lavelle, Merleau-Ponty and other phenomenologists, what is most important to me is the differences of accent between them. And there is no doubt that to my Buddhist / Dzogchen purposes I find most interesting that on which Sartre laid the stress.

333 Cf. note 153.

334 This dynamic includes the process whereby being-for-Self becomes being-for-others, which will be briefly considered in the first chapter of vol. II of this book and which I have discussed in greater detail in Capriles (1977, 1986).

335 In terms of Kant, if the judgment is deontological, then the content of the thought will be an idea or ideal or Reason; if the judgment is aesthetic, the content of the thought will pertain to the Faculty of Judgment. If what I am referring to as "judgment" is merely the recognition of a pattern or configuration in terms of the content of a thought, then in Kantian terms the content of the thought will be a concept of the Understanding. However, we cannot accept Kant's rigid compartmentalization of the psyche.

336 This condition always manifests before the arising of *samsara*: it may manifest as a rather stable *samadhi* in which there are no thoughts or movements of mind, which at some point is interrupted by the arising of *samsara*—or, if there has been a realization of *nirvana*, before *samsara* may arise, this condition will manifest for a very brief instant. Then, while *samsara* is functioning, this condition will manifest again and again between one experience and the next, between a thought and the next—though, however, most people will be utterly unable to become aware of its manifestation. The way in which *samsara* arises from this condition will be discussed in vol. II of this book, and was also described in Capriles (2004).

337 Heidegger and Plato are two of the philosophers I find particularly pernicious and which I refuted at greater or lesser length in a previous chapter of this volume. As we have seen, Plato compounded the moral dualism the Pythagoreans inherited from the Orphics, with the ontological dualism that resulted from synthesizing the positions of the Eleatics with those of the Pythagoreans (the body still corrupted the soul, no longer because the former was "impure," but because it allowed sensory perceptions to occur, and the knowledge resulting from this, which was half true and half false, replaced the absolutely true knowledge of *eidos* would-be philosophers had had before birth). The ensuing ontological and moral dualism later compounded with some of the most detrimental interpretations of the Bible (and, through Augustine of Hippo, with residues of his former Manichaeism) to dominate Western civilization. (Augustine of Hippo combined Christianity with Platonism, but the more influential Thomas Aquinas compounded Christianity with Aristotelianism; however, as Alexandre Koyré [1973] has shown, the revolution of Copernicus [1473-1543], Kepler [1571-1630] and Galileo [1564-1642] represented a renaissance of Platonism. Finally, modern scientism and technology are a development of the seeds sown by the Pythagoreans, who developed the sciences *and* their technological applications.) In Capriles (work in progress 3), I will produce an expanded version of these arguments.

338 I say "illusion" because, in the modern sense of the term, in order to be *real*, the nothingness, gap or lack that the mental subject *is* would have to be *physical*—i.e. to have *extension* or, at least (as in the case of quarks) to have mass.

339 However, I am not assuming that their research has given scientists a perfectly correct appreciation of the true condition of so-called "physical" reality. For a discussion of the capacity or incapacity of science to

determine the true condition of reality see Vol. III of this book (a less elaborate discussion of the subject was carried out in Capriles [1994a]).

[340] However, even if it were demonstrated that thoughts have a mass, and in particular that the mental subject *qua* seemingly noetic pole of the threefold thought structure has a mass, the fact that it instantly dissolves upon reGnition of its true condition would still demonstrate that, rather than being a subsistent and self-existent soul, it is a baseless appearance.

[341] As Sartre has shown, our experience of the other mental subjects is given us through our experience of becoming an object to those mental subjects in the condition that Sartre called being-for-others—which consists in "being touched in the heart by the other's look" and thus *becoming* the *object* the Other experiences as us. (Cf. the example of the man looking through the keyhole in a previous note.)

[342] See the preceding note.

[343] *Angst*, as understood by Kierkegaard, is not the same as fear. In *Begrebet Angest* (translated as *The Concept of Dread*), Kierkegaard defined *Angst* as the dizziness produced in any reasonable being who stands at the brink of genuine freedom, and as such this concept is a precedent of Sartre's concept of *angoise*, which if fear before one's own freedom and which will be discussed below in this volume. According to Kierkegaard, *Angst* has nothing as its object, which he illustrated by those cases in which someone is simultaneously drawn toward and repelled by what is strange or mysterious (an occurrence attributed to children, but which is a general human trait: otherwise adults would not watch horror movies or read terror books). Though this, rather than meaning that the experience has no object means it has switching objects, or an object that is neither clear nor distinct, it is worth noting that the attitude in question has been described as a *sympathetic antipathy* or *antipathetic sympathy*, implying multifarious possibilities and the inability to have an idea of what the future will bring. In fact, it may be related to Sartre's assertion that "vertigo" is not fear of falling, but fear of jumping (i.e., being attracted by the object of one's fear). Fear, on the contrary, involves solely antipathy—and, moreover, has as its object something specific.

Kierkegaard's "fear and trembling" (*frygt og bøven*), which is concerned with the inability to know right from wrong without logic or rational, is connected with *Angst* in that it implies an attraction for the object of fear. As Kierkegaard noted in his *Diaries*, his excesses were related to the *fear* of sin—and as such "fear and trembling," with its inherent attraction for the object of fear, may be seen as a manifestation of Freud's *Thanatos* (this concept, and its interpretation by Gregory Bateson, are discussed below in this volume).

Finally, his "despair" is the "sickness unto death (*sygdommen til døden*)"—a consequence of the belief in the immortality of the "soul," for it consists in the illness of the immortal soul that consists in the torment of "not being able to die." The cause of despair is that he "cannot consume himself, cannot get rid of himself, cannot become nothing." Thus somehow this despair is the ultimate and logical conclusion of the devil's "spirit of rebelliousness" enunciated as "I will not serve," for the despairing man refuses his own existence, which for Kierkegaard implies immortality.

[344] I.e., superfluous. Heidegger did not make these consequences of his "throwness" (*Geworfenheit*) or "state of being thrown" (*geworfen*) explicit; since he had no realization of the state in which the nonconceptual Meaning inherent in the flow of Gnitiveness becomes patent, it is unlikely that he came to realize the consequences in question. Sartre made a central point of his philosophy the idea that we feel we are *de trop*, but he did not explicitly relate this to what Heidegger called *Geworfenheit*, or to the fact that feeling separate implies feeling that experience is imposed upon us.

[345] According to some statements by Nietzsche and to the interpretation of Nietzsche by some "postmodern thinkers," this second stage of nihilism, "radical nihilism," opens the way to a necessary revaluation of all values (Nietzsche, 1967 [e.g., II:9], 1968 [e.g., pp. 55, 674], 1997b [e.g., Preface, p. 4]; Loy, 1987, p. 80); however, according to other of Nietzsche's statements, which Gianni Vattimo considers to be the genuinely postmodern ones, it should not give rise to the revaluation in question—but on the contrary should lead to "the radical repudiation of value, meaning and desirability" (Nietzsche [1968], p. 7) and hence to the third stage of nihilism, "accomplished" or "complete" nihilism. (For a discussion of this matter, see Vol. III of this book.)

[346] As we have seen, what seem to be the acts of the mental subject are in fact the play of nondual awareness. However, they are experienced as the acts of the mental subject, and it would be too inconvenient to have to explain what they really are each and every time they are mentioned.

[347] Endorphins are peptides produced by the pituitary gland and the hypothalamus in vertebrates, and they resemble the opiates in their abilities to produce analgesia and a sense of well-being. Some have claimed erotic attraction to be related to the release of dopamine, norepineprine and phenylethylamine (PEA); it has also been claimed that the latter is directly related to infatuation or, which is the same, to what we call "falling in love." However, most direct studies of the brain have been carried out in mice and rats, and studies in humans are generally scans of endorphins in the bloodstream. At any rate, it is certain that the effect of endorphins is so powerful as to allow lovers embraced under the rain not to feel cold, or in other normally uncomfortable situations not to experience discomfort.

[348] Was Albertine thinking of Sapphic adventures, or was she in body and mind with the protagonist of *La prisonnière*? The more he restricted Albertine's freedom, the more he showed her that he did not feel he deserved being loved by her over anything or anyone else—and so the more reasons he gives her not to value him... Therefore, the more he worried as to whether or she inwardly deemed him most valuable and desirable.

[349] As noted in Capriles (2003), this self-deception, instead of putting an end to the lack of plenitude that celebrities try to fill with the appreciation of fans, will cause it to increase proportionally to the number of people with whose admiration they try to fill it. Moreover, as individuals become accustomed to fame, the latter loses its power to cause them to deflect their attention from their illusory inner vacuum, which, as we have seen has increased proportionally to the number of their fans—and hence they need their fame to continue to grow without ever reaching a ceiling. Furthermore, as noted in the discussion of anxiety, they become more and more addicted to the recognition received from others: we have all seen some celebrity arrive at a public place showing signs of being worried about whether or not he or she is being recognized by those present. (The fact that some times celebrities often try to go incognito does not contradict their addiction to notoriety; on the contrary, it shows that, in spite of this addiction, fame entails great inconvenience insofar as it invades private life and curtails individual freedom. Moreover, although celebrities go incognito because they want to be ignored by the public at times when recognition by crowds could be bothersome, they would be terrified of being ignored by the crowds when they are not going incognito, for that would imply that they have lost their fame and appeal, and with it they have lost the illusory value that these used to afford them. In the same way, less famous individuals may *pretend* to go incognito only to make others believe (and thereby make themselves believe also) that they have reached a high degree of notoriety. At any rate, when negative aspects of celebrities are made public, they often suffer a nervous breakdown (as happened to Elizabeth Taylor as a result of the publication of the book written by journalist Kitty Kelly after passing herself off as a household assistant in her home). Fame, let us repeat, is a whirlpool that furthers our inner vacuum, to the extent that, in order to fill it, we need the value projected by an ever greater number of people: it is clear that, the greater quantity of something we need to fill a hole, the bigger the hole that we were trying to fill will have become.

[350] To the extent that we think these things will endow us with value in the eyes of others whom we value because they value the same individuals, groups, etc. as we do, we value and pursue them. Nevertheless, they will not provide us with stable value and happiness, for, among other things: (1) Not all human beings value the same objects, individuals and groups, so that, in order to be valued by some, we will have to be despised by others. (Of course, we in our turn value those who value precisely what we value, and consequently we are concerned as to whether or not they have a positive opinion of us; conversely, we despise whoever despises what we value, and consequently we have very little regard for their opinion of us. Nevertheless, this puts us in the hands of those whose opinion we value, for if they come to despise us or ignore us, they will succeed in harming us to the extent that we have valued them and made our own value depend on their opinion of us. Furthermore, we never succeed in completely ignoring or dismissing the judgments of those we care for the least, and so we are *to a certain extent* exposed to their judgments. Most people value those who belong to the "highest" social class, but this is not universal, for leftists, hippies, criminals and so on either despise them or are indifferent toward them. Though some value prestigious academics, others find them a bore or are indifferent toward them. Though some value the Masters of some spiritual tradition, others think they are weirdoes or are indifferent toward them. And so on.). (2) Pleasure being the result of acceptance, it is interdependent with rejection and cannot be sustained indefinitely; once we become accustomed to the positive estimation of the human entity designated by our name, habituation will cause us to stop accepting this object, and so we will become indifferent towards it—which will produce a neutral feeling that later on we will

interpret as boredom and consequently will reject, experiencing the displeasure resulting from rejection. Thus, we will migrate through the six psychological realms of the cycle of indifference, rejection and acceptance that Buddhists call *samsara*. (3) At each instant we will feel threatened by the possibility of losing what we have become attached to, and our attachments will thus become a source of anxiety and anguish. And so on.

[351] This is why in Buddhist Tantrism and Dzogchen there are methods for producing heat, which has the function of melting the nectar in our head and allowing it to go down through the successive chakras so that we may experience the successive degrees of pleasure until total pleasure be reached: the pleasure of orgasm in normal lovemaking is cannot be compared to this total pleasure, or even to the degrees of pleasure attained when the nectar reaches the higher chakras. Furthermore, this total pleasure assuages the repetitive contractions in our chakras (and particularly in the chakra in the middle of the trunk at the level of the heart) at the root of the delusory valuation-absolutization of thought; if then we apply the instructions for seeking the experiencer of pleasure, this may result in the reGnition of the Self-*qua*-base that makes up the Self-*qua*-Path—upon which the subject-object duality and the phenomenon of being instantly dissolve.

[352] I.e., Saint Augustine (who was born of Roman descent in Tagaste, Numidia, but who is called Augustine of Hippo because he became the bishop of the city of Hippo, where he had been ordained).

[353] For an explanation of the specific sense in which I am using the term *Existenzphilosophie*, see note 2 to the second chapter of this book.